

940.9307 S37w

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books maked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

BERKOWITZ ENVELOPE CO., K. C., MO.

KANSAS CITY, MO. PUBLIC LIBRARY
0 0001 0336946 8

0 0001 0336946 8

LIBRARY
of the
city
of

2011年12月29日

REF: 10

15

VARIALE Standard VTD Standard OM

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

WE TESTIFY

YARABOL OLIMIN
YTO SAZMAN
ON

PUBLIC LIBRARY
50

WE TESTIFY

EDITED BY

NANCY SCHOONMAKER

AND

DORIS FIELDING REID



SMITH & DURRELL, INC.

Publishers

New York

VARADOLLE
VTO 2421A3
01

COPYRIGHT, 1941, BY
SMITH & DURRELL, INC.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. J. LITTLE & IVES COMPANY, NEW YORK

94-1507
237W

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"Hemisphere Policy" from "Pan America" by Carleton Beals.
Courtesy of Houghton Mifflin and Company.

"If America Enters the War, What Shall I Do?" by Harry
Emerson Fosdick. Courtesy of The Christian Century.

"A Personal View" by Henry Noble MacCracken. Courtesy
of the Vassar Alumnae Magazine.

"Is Britain Fighting Our War?" from "Hell Bent for War" by
General Hugh S. Johnson. Courtesy of The Bobbs-Merrill
Company.

"Are We to Rule the World?" by Oswald Garrison Villard.
Courtesy of the Christian Century.

"Dare We Look Ahead?" from "Confessions of an Individu-
alist" by William Henry Chamberlin. Courtesy of The Mac-
millan Company.

"The Wave of the Future" by Anne Morrow Lindbergh.
Courtesy of Harcourt, Brace and Company.

250

JAN 3 1917

1060815

VSASBLI DLBLL
YTO BASBA
OM

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE EDITORS—Foreword	ix
HERBERT HOOVER	3
The Immediate Relation of the United States to This War	
CARLETON BEALS	15
Hemisphere Policy	
ROBERT M. HUTCHINS	37
War and the Four Freedoms	
HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK	49
If America Enters the War, What Shall I Do?	
CHARLES A. LINDBERGH	63
A Letter to Americans	
HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN	85
A Personal View	
HUGH S. JOHNSON	93
Is Britain Fighting Our War?	
ROBERT E. WOOD	107
America's Foreign Policy Today	

	PAGE
AMOS R. E. PINCHOT	123
Letters for the People	
FRANCES GUNTHER	137
For a Free England	
JOHN T. FLYNN	151
The Great Retreat	
IGOR SIKORSKY	169
The Nature and the Objectives of the Soviet Com- munist Government	
BURTON K. WHEELER	187
What if Germany Seizes the British Fleet?	
NORMAN THOMAS	199
Why Our Country Should Stay Out of This War	
ROBERT A. TAFT	215
Shall the President Make War Without the Ap- proval of Congress	
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD	233
Are We to Rule the World?	
WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN	243
Dare We Look Ahead?	
ANNE MORROW LINDBERGH	275
The Wave of the Future, a Confession of Faith	
ADDENDA	293

FOREWORD

Any attempt, during a period of war hysteria, to maintain and present an attitude of detached reasonableness is accompanied with great difficulties. Yet the value of such reasonableness and cool logical thinking is, particularly at such times, vitally and perhaps tragically important.

After the Great War, it was that volume by Sidney B. Fay, "Origins of the Great War," that did more than any other one thing to rid our minds of erroneous conclusions and prejudiced judgments. During the time of its preparation, Dr. Fay was regarded as little better than a traitor. But he continued on his chosen way, collecting documentary evidence, weighing reports, checking facts, revealing finally the thousand and one secret and often appalling engagements contained in those documents which the several governments had omitted from their White Papers and no mention of which had ever appeared in the world press. The product of that great labor stood and still stands as the best verified published record of what went into the making of that great holocaust.

Perhaps there is today, somewhere here in America, another great scholar who is, with clear eye and unprejudiced mind, watching and recording those events and reports—or lack of them—which are so confusing to most of us. But to the editors of this volume, it seemed apparent that such a record, invaluable as it undoubtedly would be, could still fail us in one most important way. It could cor-

rect our erroneous judgments—after the fact; but it would do so too late to save us from the dire calamity which such wrong thinking might, meanwhile, bring down upon our heads.

What America needed, we felt, was the best presentation that could be assembled of the arguments against our immediate involvement in the European war. Perhaps, we told ourselves, if such a body of opinion, taken from the writings, speeches or especially prepared documents of men and women who stand at the peak of attainment in their several fields, could be assembled and presented in book form, the people of America might be induced to stop and measure the cost of our participation—the cost not only to America but to the whole world—before it was too late.

We have, therefore, had two objectives before us in assembling and presenting this material: We believe that it will serve as a valuable record of the sanity and farsightedness of some of our ablest Americans in this hour of general hysteria; and we are hopeful that it may, at least in some measure, halt the mad rush toward involvement in a foreign war which may so easily spell the doom of the American manner of life.

We may remind ourselves that, by all the tests of public opinion that have yet been made, only a small and meager minority is shown as standing for actual American involvement in the war. It is not difficult to determine the elements which made up this influential and exceedingly vocal block of minority opinion.

There are, first, the natural and instinctive imperialists who see world domination as the ultimate destiny of the United States. For the great mass of Americans this dream has no appeal whatever, so it hardly deserves to be argued down. Next in order come the Colonial-minded Americans,

those who have somehow managed to escape the liberating influences of our Declaration of Independence; they continue to maintain a sort of fantastic first loyalty to the so-called "mother country," from which so large a part of our ancestors came, but whose policy toward us has so frequently been anything but that of a loving parent. Their convenient plea that England is our first line of defense, that she is fighting our war and that our all-out aid to her is back-handed aid for ourselves waits only another A.E.F. or another Versailles to prove its hollow vacuity. Or perhaps the vision of these feverish champions of colonial status can only be cleared by watching England assign to us the bloody task of mopping up the continent while she devotes herself to the defense of her own "tight little island."

The third and most ardent group of interventionists is made up of those whose racial kindred have suffered grievous persecution at the hands of Hitler. It is not difficult to understand their passion for vengeance. America reacts instinctively against such cruelty and oppression. But so long as we have here in our own America negro lynchings, religious intolerance and social violences of which we are all ashamed, it would seem hardly logical to attempt to involve our nation in a foreign war in order to avenge cruelties visited upon subjects of a foreign power three thousand miles away.

Endeavoring to make the record as complete as possible, we have not limited our material always to the most recent utterances of our contributors. We have, rather, deliberately chosen to include some material that was written or spoken weeks, even months, ago. Fundamental circumstances have not altered since these chapters were written, but our ability to think clearly has. As war progresses passion inevitably pushes reason into the background. To

those whose deep desire it is to let wisdom guide our country's actions, it should be of great value to read what was written in somewhat calmer times. Furthermore, it is well to realize that there were among us from the first at least a few who had a sort of prophetic vision, who, measuring words and happenings of today by those of yesterday, were able to draw conclusions which may have seemed fantastic at the time but which have since been proven appallingly accurate.

With that same objective of completeness in view, we have also chosen our contributors not on a basis of their perfect and complete accord either with one another or with the convictions which we hold ourselves. We have made but one test. Do they, one and all, believe that this is not our war and that our involvement in it most certainly imperils the welfare of this, our own country, which it is our first duty to protect? Given such belief, we asked no further agreement among them. Rather, we felt that, if that conviction did rest upon widely different and dissimilar bases, this gave an added weight to the conviction itself. So we not only allowed but sought to have every phase and shade of non-interventionist opinion expressed here in this single volume. Thus we find linked together names never before set side by side. We count this but as another evidence that the book is, in fact, a genuinely democratic expression of that which we hold as precious American.

Two of the chapters we have included are sharply critical of England. And we have not carried even one which lists the sins and misdeeds of Germany. Why? Certainly our readers have the right to an answer.

We have not, in the first place, included any criticism of Germany because it seemed to us that it would be a waste of time for both ourselves and our readers. With so

many of our books and magazines and daily papers devoting most of their space to a listing and elaboration of those sins, with our radio and our theatres and our movies given so wholeheartedly to the dissemination of those facts, who in America has been left ignorant of them? We have not interviewed our contributors on this question, but there can be little doubt that one and all agree with most of the charges laid against Hitler.

Why, then, we will be asked, launch attacks upon England?

Because, for us and to us, the supreme peril of the moment is involvement in war. That threat of involvement can come only through England. Who in America could envisage the remotest possibility of our involvement on Germany's side? No one. No, if involvement in war is the supreme danger of the moment, and that involvement can come only through some mistaken sense of responsibility not for our own future but for that of England, then certainly now is the time when we need to renew our knowledge of England's own history and record not only toward our nation and our welfare, but also toward those precious principles of freedom and democracy for which, American youths have been taught, it is worth while to die.

Perhaps no book in the world ever turned out to be exactly the sort of book its author or editor intended it to be. Yet we still feel that this book may serve the ends to which our efforts have been directed: It may be of value to future students as a record of opinion in our time; and it may have some weight in strengthening the convictions of that vast 80 per cent of Americans who stand for non-intervention, and in this way prevent what would be in our eyes the supreme tragedy of involvement in the present European war.

Associated with the editors in the selection and presentation of this material have been Mrs. John P. Marquand, Mrs. Amos Pinchot and Mrs. Gretta Palmer, whose cooperation has been invaluable.

NANCY SCHOONMAKER

Herbert Hoover

THE IMMEDIATE RELATION OF THE UNITED STATES TO THIS WAR

FOR the last six months I have remained aside from the controversy on whether we should join in this war. I have been waiting to see the progress of our preparedness. I have wanted to see the situation abroad develop more fully. I had believed that the President was earnestly endeavoring to keep his promise to the American people of October 23rd:

. . . "We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, Naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

In the past ten days we have had many speeches and much propaganda, the meaning of which is to drive the American people into this war. One who has been honored by his country as a member of America's War Council in the last world war and as its Commander-in-Chief in subsequent troubled years must learn something of the principles of national defense and our setting in the world.

It is therefore my duty to speak out of my experience. I hope that by sober discussion of the facts, I may contribute something of thought in this most fateful decision. I am not speaking as the representative of any party, of any group and committee, or any association. And despite the depth of emotion that I feel, I hope I may speak without passion

and with respect for the views of my many troubled fellow citizens.

I do not need to express again my abhorrence of the whole totalitarian movement or its dangers to the world. That there be no misunderstanding, let me state at the outset that I support provision of the maximum tools of war to Britain; that I am convinced we can give this maximum during her next critical months only if we keep out of this war; that putting our navy into action is joining this war; that the whole European war situation is in transformation; that America is as yet unprepared even for adequate defense; that our people are not united. To go in now is neither wise nor for the interest of either Britain or ourselves.

As I have listened to these recent speeches it has constantly recurred to my mind that the problem before Mr. Roosevelt is far more difficult and complex than many of these speakers imagined. In the anxiety and emotion of the moment many do not recognize the stern facts.

It is now proposed that we should put the American Navy into action. That is a straightforward, understandable proposal which boldly makes clear the meaning of words like convoys or patrols. That is joining in this war, once and for all. From here the steps would be automatic. Our Navy must attack German submarines, ships and planes, if it is to be of any use. To make it effective then we must expand naval and air bases abroad. We must equip these bases with expeditionary forces. And that is war for long years to come.

There are those who say we are already in this war. That is not true. We are in a position of risk. But war has not been declared between ourselves and the Axis. Diplomatic representatives are still maintained on both sides. Our treaties are still in force. There is no killing of men between

us. If this war were ended tomorrow, it would not be necessary for us to make a new peace with Germany.

I am not arguing the spirit of our relations with Germany. I am only discussing the situation which exists. But it is a certainty that we shall be at war the moment our Navy is put into action. We are in the war when we send our boys either by air or by sea or on expeditionary forces with an intent to shoot at the Germans. Let us not coddle ourselves by thinking otherwise.

It would be more consistent with American honesty and American courage for us to face the straight issue of a declaration of war by the Congress as the Constitution provides than to creep into an undeclared war. It is due our people that the Congress should vote on the real question which underlies all this: "Shall we declare war on Germany or Italy or Japan?" In a national debate on that issue the whole of the facts could be placed before the American people and the people could reflect their views to the Congress. That question once openly determined by the only open process democracy knows, then our people would accept that decision—whatever it might be. The full facts and the truth is the way to achieve national unity.

We must face some hard facts. And there is among them, the transformation of the military and political situation abroad. There is our own unpreparedness. There is the practical aid that Britain now requires and requires at once. There is the lack of unity of our people.

This is no time for wishful thinking. Upon our decision depends the fate of our nation. It is the time, of all times, for a sober and frank appraisal of new facts and new situations.

The first hard fact is the transformation of the character of this war. No one can deny the grim possibility that Hitler

may take Suez, Iraq, North Africa and the Mediterranean. This would not, however, cut the vital lifeline of Britain. It might even release that British fleet to protect their Atlantic lanes. In any event, Hitler can occupy all of Continental Europe.

And from all this area he will get ample food supplies and vital raw materials for the German people. True, he is blockaded by the British fleet, but the blockade cannot starve the German people or cut off their vital raw material supplies. It is only the people in the occupied democracies who will starve. Having been disarmed to their very carving knives, they cannot revolt.

A second phase of this transformation is that substantial army fighting seems likely to go into the background for many years. The British armies cannot invade Hitler's Europe. Nor do I believe with all the 6,000,000 men that Hitler commands and his superior air force that he can now cross the Channel to England. To invade Hitler's Europe would require us to prepare 5,000,000 men in addition to the British army. This time to invade Germany we would need to land them quickly and that might take 40,000,000 tons of ships to carry our army over the Atlantic. And they might not be able to land even then. It would take ten years to build those ships. And Hitler could not start toward the United States without equal preparation.

Therefore, with this transformation it does not appear that this war can be brought to a conclusion by armies or navies for years and years to come.

The undetermined weapon against Hitler is air power. And the character of air war is also being transformed. It is rapidly emerging to be long-range bombing with fighter planes to defend against the bombers. Accurate action in destruction of industrial and military objectives by daylight

is no longer possible because of the efficiency of fighter planes on both sides. Manufacture of more and more planes will thus continue on both sides. But so far there is no effective answer to night bombing. It serves mostly to destroy large objectives, the cities and harbors, reducing them to rubble and killing civilians. And in this destruction Hitler has to fly only one-third the distance that the British have to fly, to reach his point of attack.

And there is a transformation in the German blockade of England. The long-range bomber is developing as a primary weapon in the attack upon harbors and upon ships. Submarines are today partly scouts, sending word to the air forces. Naval protection of Britain's sea lanes is now subsidiary to air protection.

This moving transformation of the relation of army power, sea power and air power presents new situations which are not yet clear. They involve many new considerations. They plainly indicate that America would be joined in a long, long war without a clear method of conclusion. And they emphasize England's immediate need which I will discuss later on.

The second hard fact we must frankly face is that in the last war Japan was our ally and we had no need to defend the Pacific. But Japan is now openly allied to the Axis. She only awaits a favorable moment to realize her ambitions in Asia. That opportunity comes to her if we go to war in the Atlantic. Even if she does not open war upon us, her action and attitudes will be so potentially dangerous to us that we must instantly divert our energies to strengthen our defenses in the Pacific.

The third of these hard facts that we have to face is our unpreparedness. We have been slow to organize for defense, as is always the case in democracies.

We are not prepared to go to war. Our industry will not be tuned up for another eight or ten months to produce enough of the tools of war to equip our own defense and at the same time supply the needs of Britain. We do not have 300,000 men who are sufficiently equipped with planes, tanks and guns to meet 300,000 Germans, to say nothing of victory over 5,000,000 of them. We will not even have 1,500,000 men so equipped for probably another 12 months. We have no substantial air force of the type now being used in this war. It is true we have a magnificent navy, but even that is not yet big enough for the job which it may have to undertake if we join in this war.

And preparedness for war consists not alone of men and tools and munitions. It also embraces the spirit of a people. This war is a total war. That means every energy of a people must be mobilized. We must have a united people to make successful total war. We are united in resolution to defend the Western Hemisphere from military aggression. We are united in building whatever of a war machine is necessary for this purpose. We are united in our condemnation of aggressor nations. We are united in wanting to help England defend her independence.

But beyond this we are a divided people. Do I need to prove this disunity? There is an obvious large majority of people who oppose the sending to foreign wars of our boys either our Navy or in convoys or airplanes or expeditionary forces where they may have to shoot or be shot at. These oppositions are strongest in our youth and it is youth who must die. There is no unwillingness in them to die to defend our Hemisphere.

And to have a united people the Government must be united with the will of the people. A divided people cannot act effectively in the supreme issue of total war. That failure

in unity was part of the disaster of France. The first necessity is to follow an objective upon which our people will agree.

History will assess the condemnation or the praise for the policies and the methods which have brought us to these dangers. That is not the question now. The question is what to do from here on.

Our every sympathy, our interest is to assist the heroic defense of England. We have pledged ourselves to give Britain the aid of our factories and our farms.

Her most critical period is right now. It is during the next months. What is the urgent need of England as expressed by her leaders time and again? Plainly she needs bomber planes to guard her sea lanes. She needs bomber planes and fighter planes to offset the attacks upon her cities and her harbors. She needs tanks, munitions and food. She needs merchant ships to replace her losses. She needs minor naval warships to guard her sea lanes.

We are today giving her only a part of the scant production of our industries and retaining the other part for our own preparedness.

If we join this war we must join in earnest. We shall lose it any other way. If we join we must at once increase our army to 3,000,000 or 5,000,000 men. We would have to use a larger part of our immediate manufacturers to supply our own army. We would have to use a larger part of our air production to defend our own coast cities. We would have to at once increase our protections for the Pacific Coast and our island possessions. We would have to use a larger part of our production of fighter and bomber planes for them. We would have to hold merchant ships in reserve to carry troops to protect them. We are not building enough merchant ships now to meet British needs. We would have

to use our light naval craft to convoy and protect our own sea lanes, especially in the Pacific.

In net, if we join this war we must use a larger portion of our present scant production for our own equipment and defense. We would have to do this at once. And that means if we join in this war we must give Britain less tools of war during her most critical period.

If we stay out of this war we can take more risks in parting with our tools of war.

The British have said time and time again that if we give them the tools they have the manpower to repel invasion, they have the men to man the warships, the merchant ships, and the airplanes.

Today we are confronted with not one problem but many. What is the constructive American course amid these problems? Is it not clear that we will give less tools to Britain if we join in the war? The solution is not for us to go to war but to give her every tool that will really aid her regardless of our own preparedness. There are risks in this course but it is the least perilous road we can now take. This solution will not please extremists on either side. Common sense and stark truth rarely do. But I am convinced that here lies the road to national unity that is so essential to America at this time.

We must also think other things through. And there are some other very disagreeable questions that must be answered before we take the plunge to war. We cannot refuse to face the facts of the situation when the fate of the nation is at stake.

We wish to aid Britain, but we must face the fact that if she cannot maintain the independence of the British Isles with the tools and policies I have mentioned, it cannot be maintained by our joining in the war. If we are in the war

and should Britain fail, we would be left to carry the war alone. And that war against Nazi-controlled Europe will have to be fought at a distance of 3,000 miles and for years and years.

In that event, are we going to blockade Europe? If so, are we going to starve the 40 million people in Great Britain? And how will we bring such a war to a conclusion?

What the course of the American people may be in this conflagration of the world cannot rightly be determined now. We cannot appraise all of the factors. At the present we cannot judge the effect of the transformation going on in this war. But there are some things we can state with assurance.

Right now we need calm thinking. We need reason. We need tolerance. We need to approach these problems with deliberation. Until this picture is more clear it is folly to gamble with the fate of a nation. Strong men do not need to rush. We must not be swept off our feet by the profound depth of our emotions. By no hasty or emotional act must we jeopardize the aid to Britain and the future of America.

Finally we must not forget the price we shall have to pay if we join in this war.

It means the sacrifice of our most precious lives and the hopes of millions of mothers and wives. It means the sacrifice also of our own liberty to a dictatorship of our own, inevitable in total war.

If we go into war, we must pass through post-war bankruptcy. The savings of the people will be lost. The endowments of our universities, colleges, hospitals will be destroyed. And when the day of transformation of war into peace comes the Government will not be able to support the unemployed and the farmers. In this gulf all major in-

dustry must be operated by the Government. When we go to the peace table, hate will again as before sit at that table endeavoring to destroy the hope of any real peace among men. Liberty will not recover on this Continent for a generation.

But if despite all this price we are compelled to act with our military power, let us be thoroughly prepared. Let us make our determination within the frame of our Constitution by the decision of Congress. And when that decision is made, there will be no disunity in America.

The Germans know all about our slow preparedness. They need have no momentary satisfaction in our unpreparedness. That will be forthcoming. The potential might of this nation is the strongest thing in this whole world. If necessary, we can raise and we can eventually equip an army of as many millions of men as we need. We can make more ingenious tools of war and we can operate them better than any nation in the world. That strength is always here in America. The defense of the United States is not dependent upon any other nation. America cannot be defeated.

Carleton Beals

HEMISPHERE POLICY

Most United States Americans probably would agree that any New World program must be postulated not merely on our own best national interests, but on the best interests of all the other Western Hemisphere nations. Unfortunately those interests do not always coincide. We think of Latin America as a storehouse of natural wealth that Americans, by some divine right should possess and exploit. Very curiously, the Latin Americans see the matter quite differently. For Latin Americans, not only do Nazis and Fascisti constitute Fifth Columns, but also many 'alien' Americans and Britishers. Latin America frequently wants our help less than we want her wealth.

Most United States Americans fail to comprehend southern grievances. Whether our marines have been stalking the streets of Managua, or our sanitary meat regulations have irked Argentina, or we have massacred Puerto Rican Nationalists, we have invariably looked upon ourselves as the great Sir Galahad of the New World. Does not our Monroe Doctrine keep the big bad European wolf away from the Latin-American doorstep?

But Monroeism and force do not wear the same garb above the Rio Grande as below it. The Latin Americans remember that if the Monroe doctrine has kept out some Europeans, England has been allowed to seize additional territory. At this very moment Great Britain is definitely

violating the Monroe Doctrine. Why, they ask, has the United States let England override this doctrine while it sends harsh notes to Germany about possible violations? Is it such a flimsy doctrine that it can be set aside by any European nation the United States happens to favor? Remarks one Mexican paper, "The British possessions in the New World are all busy making war on Germany. . . . If Germany were to land troops in Canada or on any other British colonial possessions in the Western Hemisphere, American states would no doubt issue a call to arms against Nazi aggressors. This clearly reveals the double standard of morals' of the Monroe Doctrine as it is administered in Washington.

Perhaps it may be a good thing for Europe to have some Western Hemisphere possessions, says a Mexican journal. They serve as a counterpoise to the United States' overwhelming power. When Secretary Hull recently warned Germany about the Monroe Doctrine, he said: "It contains not the slightest vestige of any implication, much less assumption, of hegemony on the part of the United States." He stated also that the doctrine never had resembled the policies of aggressor nations carrying on conquest by the sword for economic and political domination.

"How then," asked a Cuban paper, "did the United States so greatly increase its territorial extent since Monroe's time?"

The Latin Americans say that the Monroe Doctrine lost much of its validity when the United States intervened in Europe and Asia, acquiring the Philippines and engaging in the first World War, and that our present intervention in outside affairs correspondingly entitle European countries to meddle in the New World. Argentina has repeatedly pointed this out to the United States. Brazil asks, if we

wish to cut her off from Europe, what we intend to do about her great cotton crop, her surplus coffee crop, her large shipments of bananas and fruits and vegetable oils to European countries. She cannot destroy her major markets merely to please a frightened United States.

She has no desire either to conform to theories (which she does not share) about the worth of democracy, American style, or capitalism, American style. Since our economic blundering, the southern countries have had growing doubts as to the stability, efficiency, and justice of the American system. The United States no longer impresses them as such a desirable model.

Brazil's production, trade, culture, and tradition all dovetail better with Europe than with those of the United States. What have we to offer? Can we defend Brazil? Can we take her products? Can we respect her culture and institutions? Before Argentina and Brazil cast caution to the winds, they will have to get more than promises from us. The South American countries cannot afford to break with Europe and follow the present belligerent lead of the United States.

Brazil and Argentina do not feel that Washington has demonstrated either the intention or the power to protect the continent, should they abandon neutrality as we have done. Our policy of continental defense is vague and ill-defined. Can we defend all of South America, and do we intend to? We pour out millions for defense, and yet we have not decided on a definite line of defense.

Several of the South American countries are closer to Spain and Portugal than to New York. Nearly the whole of South America lies east of New York. To cross the South Atlantic from either West Africa or the Cape Verde Islands takes only five hours by air. A powerful and aggressive

country in control of Senegal in Africa would have great advantages over the United States, militarily, by air, and commercially.

So, despite the Havana Conference, these countries are sitting tight, still waiting to see which way to jump. They have real doubts, should they follow our lead in antagonizing Germany, whether the United States really is able or willing to defend Latin America.

The United States must also move in new ways in order to convince the southern countries that there will be sufficient economic benefits from us to offset any flouting of their European ties. They have felt that the bravado of our airplanes and the maneuvers of our fleet were meant more to overawe them than to frighten any European nation.

They see no essential difference between being conquered or coerced by the United States and by Germany. They wish neither to happen. Why, they now ask in pointed editorials, should the American National Guard invade the sovereign soil of another American nation when the Pan-American pacts forbid the use of the peacetime power just granted to Roosevelt. Remarks one Argentine daily: "The North American wolf growls at Europe, but his jowls will crunch on us."

General alarm was created throughout Latin America by the following Washington news dispatch (June 6, 1941): "President Roosevelt's plan for combating Hitlerism in this hemisphere involves a United States on the Western Hemisphere, maintained by military force and dominated by the United States.

"This country would have naval and air bases in Latin America. It would send troops to help quell Fifth-Column manifestations or revolutions. Troops of this nation would

be permanently stationed in Central and South America until the Hitler menace disappears.”

This is little different from Hitler's concept of the New Europe.

The general alarm is given point by the present secret pressure of our State and War Departments to force the southern countries to grant us additional sea, air and army bases. Latin Americans note that our new defense appropriations include ten million dollars for acquiring such outlying bases. They see little difference in this from Russian demands on Finland or Latvia.

Congressman Andrew J. May, Chairman of our House Military Affairs Committee, demands (May 30, 1940) that the southern countries permit the United States to establish air bases and fortifications in some of their territories for the defense of the Panama Canal, and that they also assume some responsibility for the defense of that canal. But the southern folk remember that the Canal Zone was wrenched away from Colombia by threat of force, and that today they have no say whatever in the administration or use of that canal. When Peru had trouble with Colombia, her war vessels were not allowed to use the canal in order to go up the Amazon River to protect Leticia and Iquitos, but our transports steamed through to land marines in Honduras and Nicaragua. We have not suggested that Colombian or Mexican troops be quartered at the canal, or that Argentina battleships be detailed to defend it, remarks a Chilean magazine.

A few countries have secretly yielded to our demands in the same fashion as Latvia, Lithuania, and Esthonia earlier yielded to the demand for new Soviet bases within their once-sovereign territory. The larger and more distant Latin-

American countries have resisted and are urging the weaker nations to resist.

Such secret pressure called forth the grieved statement of Brazil's foreign minister, Oswald Ahanha, heretofore the closest political friend of the United States in the Vargas administration, to the effect that:

"We do not want the United States to build or pay for our naval and air bases, but need credit to build them ourselves, so we shall control them ourselves in accord with the United States and the rest of the Americas for inter-American co-operation against foreign aggression."

Negotiations were also carried on behind the scenes at the Havana Conference, July 20, for such military footholds. Promises of huge loans were part of the bait held forth for the cession of integral territory to the United States. All this has been knocking the good-neighbor policy into a cocked hat.

Says a Colombia paper, organ of the Conservative Party: "At Havana an agreement was solemnly reached to put any transferred European possessions under Pan-American trusteeship. We do not doubt the need of the United States for certain additional air bases, but the present Roosevelt program of utilizing the dire straits of the collapsing British Empire to seize such bases without consulting the rest of the continent or the wishes of the people of Trinidad, is neither democratic nor honest. Trinidad should be part of Venezuela, not a fief of North American naval officers. We talked at Havana of joint continental defense. Instead, Roosevelt rushed to Canada to make an alliance, with dangerous war implications, quite apart from the rest of the two continents. . . . How long is Latin America going to continue to take stock in these hypocritical and false-front Pan-American conferences?"

"At last," says *Omega Nueva*, "the Yankee military heel is planted on the soil of South America. The good-neighbor policy has been so much soothing-syrup. Years ago Uncle Sam pretended to aid Venezuela against British encroachment. Now Uncle Sam plants his guns on the rim of Venezuela, in Trinidad, and in British Guiana. The defense of the Canal? Without doubt. But also the deal smells of oil. Let Venezuela try to reclaim its lost wealth as Mexico has done? The eagle flies southward. South America now must unite or die. Naziism is a remote and passing menace. Yankeeism is an immediate and permanent menace, now and for all time."

Both Argentina and Brazil have opposed the suggestion of defense pacts between the United States and Latin-American countries which would permit United States occupation. *El Universo* of Ecuador, warning against the Export-Import Bank loan to save the country from its present financial difficulties, stated that previous loans were refused because "the North American government lacked confidence in the solvency of certain South American countries." Now, "exactly when all economic prospects are adverse, this credit is granted, as though the present war offered the North American government an opportunity to operate to its own advantage." If Ecuador should not be able to meet the service on the loan, she would become subject to further unspecified demands by her creditor. Even before the war, the editorial continues, the United States attempted to rent the Galapagos Islands as a defense base for the Panama Canal. Now, it goes on, the Ecuadorian coast and naval and aviation bases had been occupied and established in the name of continental defense by the ruse of making geographic studies with the United States aircraft tender *Sandpiper* and navy planes.

All this, says *El Universo*, represents "a protection very dangerous for our country." True enough, "America must be united for its defense," but this "must not imply the holocaust of our sacred liberty and sovereignty, which would be in danger if left in the hands of the powerful nations to the north."

The coalition parties behind the present Chilean government passed a joint resolution to call a continental congress to oppose German, British, and United States imperialism. Perhaps stung by the storm of criticism blowing up from below the Rio Grande, Secretary Hull hastened to inform the Chilean government that the bases would all be put at the disposition of Latin-American naval and air forces. This should turn the edge of much southern criticism, and raise the question whether they will reciprocate.

Roosevelt also hastened to announce a new treaty with the Dominican Republic. The new arrangement calls for the withdrawal of the American customs collector and the restoration of control of Dominican finances to the local government, thus wiping out the last tie-up with previous marine intervention. It was tantamount to a statement to all Latin America that though the United States, because of the present world situation, must protect the Panama Canal, it has no desire to interfere with the internal politics of the countries to the south.

Certainly the United States, we may add, cannot escape the logic of the airplane and bomber range, nor the imperatives of continental organization. But the constant aim of our policies should be that this organization does not destroy the rights of free peoples, that the hopes we have built do not perish even under the blow of danger and necessity. If we should fail to guarantee along with our own the freedom of the peoples we protect, we are not likely

to keep ours either. We cannot rest in the limbo of mere armed defense against Hitler, but our aims must become constantly more positive. We should not pause in the task of helping to build the New World we desire.

A further element in any successful defense of Latin America is a peaceful continent. This seems a hopeful likelihood at present, but not too greatly to be counted on. The American countries have for more than a century warred almost incessantly in some quarter or other.

If internal war should come to South America, the contending countries would, as do all countries under such conditions, inevitably seek outside aid, ours and that of Europe and even possibly that of Asia. We might then find ourselves, instead of enjoying a united front with other western continents, merely trying to balance the power of a divided America.

Military co-operation therefore would have to depend upon the strengthening of South America's own defenses. Any assistance in that direction should be thoughtfully considered. Have we put our relations with South America on such a completely assured economic and political footing as to be sure of a full, durable alliance with them? Not until a definite military alliance is ratified by the American Congress should we risk placing more armaments in the hands of countries which might prove unfriendly in time of stress. The safety of our nation is too important to be sacrificed to wishful thinking, romantic concepts, false heroics, theories of continental independence, or even the Monroe Doctrine.

For all our goodwill cant and Pan-American conferences, there is not one single organ through which to co-ordinate the policies of the twenty-one American republics, to harmonize the action of two-score army, navy, and air staffs, or

to undertake common economical and financial steps. All existing bodies are empowered only to consult, and must refer all decisions back to their respective governments. Few proposed treaties for the continent have ever been ratified by a majority of the countries or by the United States. There are merely many good resolutions and pious promises.

The successful defense of South America by us would rest on a number of factors. First of all, the countries, besides asking for American assistance, will have to bear the brunt of the defense themselves. This will require (1) that economic bonds with the United States be strengthened to a point equal to those with Europe, (2) that the southern countries emerge as rapidly as possible from a semi-colonial status to adult nationhood, (3) that the stamina of the population be improved by better living standards, and (4) that the armed defenses to the south be improved.

What, then, are the positive steps that must be taken to create a vital hemisphere policy?

An effective hemisphere policy is dependent upon our general international policy and world events.

Just as it is impossible to create an isolated United States, so is it impossible to isolate a hemisphere. Before a constructive hemisphere policy can be formulated, our general world policy must be determined. Our present international policies are based on:

- (1) Opposition to all international aggression. (But we cannot prevent international aggression, are not preventing it, and will not prevent it in Europe or Asia. Can we do so in the Western Hemisphere?)
- (2) Strict maintenance throughout the world of the pre-war *status quo*. (The pre-war *status quo*—and very

unjust it was—is gone forever, and instead of upholding our determination to recognize *no changes* made by force after a certain date anywhere in the world, we may be ignominiously reduced to deciding *which changes* we shall recognize.)

- (3) The sacred rights of small nations, except those of Puerto Rico and Panama and the Caribbean in general, and subject nations ruled by the British, French, Dutch, Belgian Empires.
- (4) The open door everywhere. (It no longer exists anywhere in the world, and least of all in the United States itself. Can a Japanese own land in California? An American can own land in Manchukuo. To a limited extent the only open-door region left in the world is Latin America, and that is mostly theoretical.)
- (5) The free market and free trade. (Closed-trade empires make such a program wholly unfeasible.)

Instead of merely denouncing international aggression, we should be equally vigorous in attempting to remove its causes. Before rushing to defend the *status quo*, we should be sure that it represents the sort of justice that we postulate. Mere opposition to armed aggression, to Naziism, to revolution is not a program. It is a negative, legalistic, sterile role which will mean ultimate defeat. A positive program should be aimed at disarming those dark forces by removing their justification. But that cannot be achieved overnight. It is a long-time problem. We are faced with immediate dangers.

In the meantime, it is not likely that the British Empire will voluntarily relinquish its grip on subject peoples and world resources or abandon its new totalitarian trade meth-

ods. It is not likely that Germany will cease its struggle to control the European Continent. Nor is it likely that Japan or Russia or Germany or Italy or any other country is going to change its social system or its form of government to suit the United States. We resist outside efforts to change our own system. Somehow we shall have to learn to work with governments which we do not particularly like.

That it will, at least for a time, be a far more dangerous world, no one doubts. It will require American armament. Since we cannot enforce an equitable distribution of raw materials of the world—and we have shown no great eagerness to espouse such a cause—it will require us, before we can inaugurate any more ideal world, to *be certain of our own essential supplies and our own economic security in this troubled world*. We shall have a job fully big enough in our own country and the Western Hemisphere.

Whatever the course of empire elsewhere in the world, or even if we get into war, we still have an opportunity to promote certain American principles on these two home continents. We have not used our imaginations enough. Can we not perhaps work out here those principles and at the same time increase our own power and security?

Such a New World policy requires more than verbal pyrotechnics about the sacred Monroe Doctrine, or even military defense of two continents. Formulated more than a century ago to meet an old-style European imperialism, the doctrine provides no defense against Fifth-Column methods or the modern devices of imperialism, or against economic penetration. In fact, our cardinal principles of the open door, freedom of propaganda and so on, make it inconsistent for us to object to improper activities by other powers. It does not provide a living defense of the Americans, and does not give us any guide as to the new economic policy that must

evolve if the famous doctrine is not to be left a hollow shell or a bit of meaningless flag-waving oratory.

These two complementary instruments, the Monroe Doctrine and force, are but negative policies. They defend against actual invasion, but do not create anything except force. They do not determine the kind of relations, political, military, and economic, that we have or expect to have with Latin America. If anything, Monroeism and force have led us in the past into aggression against Latin America and threaten to do so again. Until the doctrine is fully accepted by Latin America, it remains a coercive measure against the very nations it is presumed to be protecting.

To have moral validity and contribute to a new continental program, the Monroe Doctrine must be accepted by our neighbor countries and implemented by them; we and they together must force its observance by outside Powers. Heretofore, it has been defended by us alone by a combination of luck, publicity, and threatened force. It has never had a real test of force, although a number of controversies, as that with England over the Venezuelan boundary line, have eddied about it. How can it be made into a truly continental doctrine, instead of one depending merely on the whim or convenience of the United States?

Much opposition was formerly exerted by us against the Latin-American countries, to prevent any such inter-American formula as, for instance, was brought up at the fifth Pan-American Conference in Chile in 1923. At that time the cry of the southern countries for a valid inter-Americanism was inspired by a desire to defend themselves, not against Europe, but against marine intervention by the United States.

More recently we have been the ones to attempt to give the doctrine the moral strength of broader continental sup-

port. The southern countries were glad to have us accept a resolution at the Lima Conference outlawing armed intervention, but they have been reluctant to go further in any binding inter-American arrangements. Considerable strides have been made, however, in the direction of inter-Americanism, *probably more by Secretary Cordell Hull than by all his predecessors since the doctrine was first enunciated.*

In the Western Hemisphere itself the goal should constantly be free, independent nations and free peoples. It is necessary to take a brief glance at the long-range political program essential for the creation of such a continent of free peoples:

- (1) Reiterated respect for our recently signed non-aggression agreements with Latin America, and a constant attempt to rectify as far as is reasonable the evils of our past aggressions. Immediate and reiterated declaration by our State Department of our determination never to seek additional New World territory.
- (2) Preparation for the political independence or freedom or statehood of Puerto Rico.
- (3) Plebiscites at given intervals by the people of the Virgin Islands to determine their political status.
- (4) Joint control by the New World Nations, with due regard for the needs of American defense, of the Panama Canal or any other future interoceanic canal. To insist on maintaining undivided control of the canal, while at the same time attempting to violate other sovereignties by demanding air and sea bases and quartering of troops, is not greatly different from Hitler's system of organizing the new Europe. If we take we shall have to give.

- (5) The cancellation of British and French debts whenever those countries set free their subject New World populations. Plebiscites of the respective people to determine whether they desire independence or which nation they wish to join.
- (6) Constant joint New World, and separate, national pressure on England for the return of the Falkland Islands to Argentina and British Honduras to Guatemala and Mexico—both taken in violation of the Monroe Doctrine and both still vigorously claimed by the three Latin-American countries.
- (7) Constant organized propaganda to convince Canada and Newfoundland of the advantages of independence and the necessity of voting themselves free of the British Empire. A definite joint warning by the New World countries that we want no European wars dragged into this continent.
- (8) The immediate evacuation of British troops from Netherlands possessions on this continent and their occupation by New World forces under the Havana trusteeship plan, occupation to be followed by plebiscites which shall be mandatory.
- (9) A proper Pan-American solution for Greenland.
- (10) No change in the New World political or military *status quo* without joint Pan-American agreement. When we deny other nations the right to new naval bases in the Western Hemisphere we should not use that as a shield to seize them ourselves.

The achievement of each of these objectives would increase inter-American harmony and lessen the possibility of New World involvement in European struggles.

The war has brought vividly to the fore the danger of

strategic European possessions near our own shores; in an hour of danger we now rush to try to make hasty arrangements that should have been made decades earlier. In naval, military, and aviation circles, it has long been recognized that European-owned islands lying in this hemisphere offer bases for would-be aggressors and also for defense against attack. The public was little aware of this, however, until Germany conquered Denmark, of which Greenland is a colony, dominated the Netherlands, which own Aruba, Curaçao, and Bonaire near the Panama Canal, and defeated France, which possesses islands off Canada and in the West Indies and French Guiana in South America. Transfer of any of these islands to Nazi control would be a serious matter; transfer of some of them, catastrophic.

The British possessions themselves become an increasing problem for the United States, only partly solved by the new bases. We have seen England recently occupying Dutch possessions in violation of the Monroe Doctrine, a procedure that has already cost us much in prestige in the eyes of Latin America. We have been witnessing the blockade of French Martinique by British gunboats, quite in violation of the Monroe Doctrine and of the three-hundred-mile neutrality zone agreed upon at the Pan-American Conference at Panama.

If the Havana Conference of July, 1940, did not get very far in solving these thorny questions, at least it did attempt to make continental problems the concern of all the countries, and although allowing each country to act alone in an emergency, it provided for joint trusteeship of former European colonies, a distinct moral advance over the days when we took Cuba and Puerto Rico from Spain.

Did the obtaining of the new bases from England violate the letter or only the spirit of the Havana accord? The

tenor of many Latin-American comments is to the effect that we have now flung the whole good-neighbor policy out the window. The Hull offer of joint use removes, at least in part, the basis for such charges. Certainly the matter emphasizes anew the importance of constantly stressing the ideal for the Western Hemisphere of politically free peoples and co-operative effort.

To the basic program of throwing our weight constantly on the side of creating a hemisphere of free peoples, must be added a policy for bringing those free peoples into closer accord to create working economic relationships that will strengthen such bonds, to promote the several interests of the various peoples. This is tied up with our whole security in this troubled world, a world being carved up into mighty continental units and ruled by regimes alien indeed to our philosophy of life and our hopes as a people.

On what basis can we bring the continent closer together, not with platitudinous goodwill, but with commercial relations which will insure economic progress and overwhelm extra-continental influences, prevent our own encirclement and make possible a defendable and workable system?

It would be fatal to try to organize this hemisphere, whatever the temptation, on the purely closed-door basis that motivates the other great Powers. That is the sort of imperialism and mercantilism we oppose. We should fail. Nationalism is too advanced in Latin America.

Any sound solution requires us, first of all, to get our own economic household in order; thus, to create a proper demand here for the Latin-American goods we really need, not those to be dumped on us by reciprocity treaties or by buying up competitive products; second, to strengthen Latin-American economies by assistance in promoting new necessary industries, wherever there is a possibility of pro-

duction proving as economical as, or more so than, in the United States or elsewhere, and wherever it would, in any case, be of political or social or strategic benefit. This must be done in line with a definite raw-material policy into which we should fit our program for Latin America for peace-time production.

Our whole national security and the efficiency of our production require such a policy, if we are to maintain our position in a world of increasing economic nationalism and imperialism, of vast intricate trade controls, of monopolized raw materials. There is required a reorganization of our trade and investment practices in line with such a raw-material program and in line with a hemisphere policy. Gold and silver purchasing should gradually be abandoned. Investments abroad, either private or federal, should be directed or stimulated to further such a policy, and not be allowed to contribute to the creating of foreign-controlled monopolies that jeopardize our safety.

This will require the utilization, not as a general trade policy, but with respect to such key materials and with respect to specific trade conditions in specific countries, of quotas, barter, tariff rebates, preferential tariffs, export duties (the sacred Constitution will have to be revised), long-term contracts with foreign governments and industries, proper use of our purchasing power, and other devices.

We must carefully survey our own and world resources to determine the most feasible ways to guarantee our needs, free ourselves from international monopolies, and promote production as close at home as possible. We shall find that if we are not entirely self-sufficient ourselves, the Western Hemisphere is well-nigh self-sufficient for all needs of modern industry.

This policy should be coupled with the constant conservation of strategic materials within our own borders.

But only through a proper recognition of the problem of strategic materials will it be possible, perhaps, eventually so to organize the Western Hemisphere as to make it invulnerable to outside attack and prevent European imperialism from descending upon it in improper ways. We now have a sphere of influence there. We have a political and military map of Latin America and the United States, of the New World (largely drawn up and designed on purely selfish terms that frequently antagonize our neighbors), but we have no real economic map of the Western Hemisphere, no plan for proper economic relations, beyond the recently suggested loan and cartel method, one of the most disastrous proposals ever set forth, and several piecemeal projects.

Not isolation, not imperialism, not musty Hull liberalism, but a new creative foreign policy, active and fearless, attuned to the best interests of America with respect to the realities of the present international scene, is required. Though realistic, it need not be without idealistic aims, but in any case it would not sacrifice our national welfare to any theory, however idealistic.

We can begin to build a new western front, not with platitudes, but with economic realities, which will lessen the danger of our encirclement, isolation, and defeat; and in that process we can perhaps still salvage the freedom of thought and expression, the free culture, which in the long run vitalize a people.

Robert M. Hutchins

WAR AND THE FOUR FREEDOMS

I AM for aid to Britain. I am against naval or military intervention in this war.

For ten long years we tried one expedient after another to recover from a war. That war, for this country, had not been a bad one. But the effects of it, in terms of inflation and deflation, of delirium and depression, of hate and fear, were still being felt after twenty years.

Before 1917 the country had serious problems. The war settled none of them and produced some new ones we never dreamed of. From 1919 to 1929 we paid no attention to these problems, or to anything else, except the price of stocks. From 1929 to 1939 we thought of nothing but these problems. We applied a whole pharmacopoeia of desperate remedies and succeeded only in doing a few things that ought to have been done years before. We passed the Wagner Act, the social security legislation, and the Securities Exchange Act. We started the TVA. But there was little fundamental improvement. We were depressed and bewildered. We had some hope that some day we might get somewhere. We just couldn't see quite how.

When the war broke out, in 1939, the country recognized that its difficulties were still unsolved. Our liberals had been telling us for years that the first World War was accountable for many of them. They urged us not to be drawn into another conflict which could only aggravate diseases that

had already proved nearly fatal. Leading businessmen warned us that there was nothing in war for business. They knew that though war business would be large, it might not be profitable; that if there were profits they would not last; and that the collapse of industry after the war would cancel them.

We wanted Hitler to be defeated. We knew all about him and didn't like any of it. We wanted the British to win. We like them. They speak the same language. They have an analogous constitutional system. We are accustomed to dealing with them. In 1939 we felt that a British victory would be advantageous to us. We did not believe that it was our only hope. We did not believe that our safety, or the integrity of our institutions, or the contribution we could make to the welfare of mankind depended on a British victory. Nobody offered the faintest suggestion that we should go to war. We knew too much about war to be deceived again.

How different is the spectacle today. Instead of working still to solve the problems resulting from the last war, we have been quivering for months on the brink of another. The President has been conducting a war of nerves against the Axis—and against his own people. The speeches of his representatives, from the Vice President down to Senator Pepper, have all the marks of a concerted campaign to frighten us into war. We have every reason to fear that we shall enter this war for democracy without resort to democratic processes. Because totalitarian powers do not declare war, but simply start shooting, this democratic nation, we hear, in its war for democracy should do the same thing.

We have stopped trying to make democracy work. The liberals now tell us that we cannot have democracy in this country unless the British Empire is preserved. Many lead-

ing businessmen hint that Hitler will starve us if he wins. Everybody tells us that Hitler will arrive in South America, or at the Panama Canal, or at New York City within a few minutes, days, months, or years after he has conquered England.

This, then, is the spectacle. It is the spectacle of a country with appalling problems, many of them resulting from the last war, about to plunge into another in the hope of ending its troubles that way. In the life of individuals this method of solving problems is known as suicide.

If we don't want to commit suicide, if we want to preserve our country, these problems must be solved. Let me recall a few of them: The problem of unemployment. Is the war a WPA project? The problem of social justice, justice to the Negro, to the sharecropper, to the migratory worker, to the exploited members of our economic system. The problem of clearing the slums and building 10,000,000 decent homes. The problem of the land, and of gaining access to it for the people. The problem of the machine, and how to direct it to the common good. The problem of starvation in the midst of plenty, politely called the problem of distribution. The problem of adequate medical care. The problem of agriculture. The problem of monopoly. The problem of capital and labor. The problem of political corruption. The problem of education. Last December, Mr. Walter Lippmann said "that the prevailing system of education is destined, if it continues, to destroy western civilization, and is in fact destroying it." If Mr. Lippmann is right, and I think he is, we would gain little by defeating Hitler unless we could reform education at the same time. But we obviously cannot guarantee a British victory and reform education, or anything else, at the same time. We cannot fight a total war and at the same time solve the overwhelming problems that

must be solved if we are to make democracy work in this country.

We present a strange, and even an unprecedented, spectacle when we look at ourselves from the military point of view. We have not been attacked. We are not prepared. Hitler's public statements about this country, at least when compared with those of our leaders about Germany, have been characterized by moderation and reserve. Certainly no country ever entered a great war so unprovoked and so unprepared. Military nations have gone to war without provocation. Provoked nations have gone to war without preparation. For a nation to go to war as unprovoked and as unprepared as we are must be unique in history. We present the strange spectacle of a country dragging itself by its own bootstraps into a war which it did not begin, for which it is not responsible, for which it is not ready, and which, only a few months ago, it was determined never to enter.

I believe that we could win this war. I do not see precisely how we could win it, but I have faith that the vast resources of our land and the technological genius of our people would conquer in the end. But at how distant an end, and at how great a cost! On the basis of anything we know now we could not expect the end in less than five years. The cost is the sacrifice of the institutions we would be fighting to save. The cost is the sacrifice of millions of our youth.

But we are told we have no choice. Hitler will decide. Perhaps we shall be forced into bankruptcy, revolution, and totalitarianism at home. But we must make up our minds now to defeat Hitler or be defeated by him. If we are defeated by him, we shall have all this and Hitler too.

I insist that today we have a choice, that today we can decide. Will Hitler attack us? Not if we are prepared. Will

he penetrate South America? Not if we deal justly and intelligently with her; not, for example, if we adopt Secretary Knox's proposal for an immediate customs union with the Latin-American nations. Shall we be able to survive in a totalitarian world? The loss of all the foreign trade we have had in the last decade would cost less than one year of war. Shall we suffer the fate of Denmark and Norway? Not unless we stop building battleships and bombers; not unless the Atlantic Ocean is rolled back to make a pathway for the enemies of God.

Things will be bad for this country, and for the world, whether we go to war or not. They will be far worse if we go in than if we stay out. To stake the lives and fortunes of our people, and the hopes of the world, on the nightmares and bogeys that have been conjured up to scare us is to betray humanity. We know the horrors of war. They are obvious. They are inevitable. The horrors we are told we shall undergo if we stay out of war are the products of hypothesis and hysteria.

The United States must prepare to meet the totalitarian onslaught if, or when, it comes. We are working hard on military preparation. Military preparation suffices for defense. It suffices even for conquest. But for the peace that must come sometime, another kind of preparation is required. All we have to do is to recall our incompetence to deal in time of peace with those domestic problems that haunted us during the depression. With a multitude of gadgets, we were sinking into poverty. With a decreasing death rate, we had yet to discover what to do with our lives. With a love of liberty, we did not know how to use our freedom or how to free the economic slaves among our population. I have faith that we can gradually muster the military

strength to win the war. I see no sign that we possess the moral, intellectual, and spiritual strength to write the peace.

I am not an isolationist. I have not joined the America First Committee. I do not like its name. I should like to join a committee for Humanity First. If the United States can serve humanity, it should do so, no matter what the cost in blood and treasure. The United States cannot serve humanity by making the totalitarian revolution world-wide. Yet if Hitler is really devoted to the totalitarian ideal, and is prepared to suffer personal defeat to realize it on a world scale, he should pray for America's entrance into this war. For it would follow, as the night the day, that a totalitarian banner would be raised over the Western Hemisphere.

But the peace-war is for the sake of peace. Since I believe that we shall have a totalitarian government after the war, I cannot see it writing a just and durable peace. But suppose that by some miracle we were to defeat the totalitarian powers without becoming one ourselves. Would we be prepared, even then, to write a just and durable peace?

We do not know what to do with ourselves. What shall we do with the Germans, Italians, and Japanese? Are we going to exterminate them? If not, we shall have to make them free and democratic, when we have not achieved freedom and democracy for ourselves. What shall we do with the British and the Chinese? Are we going to fight them to make them see things our way? What shall we do with Czechoslovakia, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, France, Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Rumania, Jugoslavia, and Greece? Are we to restore the *status quo*, which contributed to this war, and simply hope that it will work next time? Until we know what to do with ourselves we can hardly venture to set the whole world right.

American imperialism I can comprehend. I can compre-

hend the position of those who want the United States to take charge of the world and run it at a profit. No member of the Humanity First Committee could favor such a course. I can neither comprehend, nor favor, a program by which the United States proposes to force the four freedoms on the rest of the world. We haven't got them. We don't understand them. And we don't really care very much about them. If we set out to impose our conception of them on the rest of the world, we can end only by establishing an empire. Empire means money and power. We may not understand or care about the four freedoms. We do understand and we do care about money and power. I have no more desire to see the world enslaved to the United States than I have to see it enslaved to Germany.

But, you say, suppose America is not perfect. Do we have to be perfect to be helpful? Aren't our ideals and our form of government better than those of the Axis? Wouldn't it be better for the world to have us write the peace, frail creatures though we are, than to have the gangsters of the Axis write it?

Our ideals and our form of government are better than those of the Axis. If we could persuade the Axis to adopt them, we would serve humanity well. But our form of government will not survive participation in this war. And our ideals will be unrecognizable by the time they have gone through a conflict in which we can succeed only if we have learned to hate everybody but the English, the Chinese, and the Latin Americans.

Our professed ideals and our theory of government are far better than those of the Axis. Our practice of life and government is better than that of the Axis. But our practice is not enough better to justify the hope that after we have won the war for democracy we can write a democratic

peace. Our practice is not enough better to make the peace enough better to justify the slaughter of millions of men of all nations and the destruction of civilization and the hopes which all the world now places on America.

A fraction of our population have understood and tried to practice the four freedoms at home. Mr. Roosevelt has tried to practice them. Many liberals are now among the most earnest advocates of war. Their theory is that if we can only get rid of Hitler our problems will be solved.

We got rid of the Kaiser, and a worse than the Kaiser arose. If we get rid of Hitler, will not a worse than Hitler arise? The idealism and liberalism of Woodrow Wilson did not save us. When we had conquered, we did nothing to establish the four freedoms. We relapsed into "normalcy."

Those who have understood and practiced the four freedoms will not write the peace. Or if they do, why should they be any more successful in writing a just and lasting one than Wilson was? Randolph Bourne, the young poet who died during the last war, said, "If it is a question of controlling war, it is difficult to see how the child on the back of the mad elephant is to be any more effective in stopping the beast than the child who tries to stop him from the ground."

How can the United States serve humanity? It can serve humanity by resuming the long, hard fight for the four freedoms at home. We must translate them from rhetoric into practice. We cannot get them by going to war. To get them we must put forth years, or even centuries, of unremitting effort. We must dedicate ourselves to service and sacrifice instead of to profit and power. If we would change the face of the earth, we must first change our own hearts. If we will fight for the four freedoms with the same devo-

tion that total war demands, we have a chance to get them for ourselves and for our fellow men.

We are the only people who have. If we plunge into war, we shall deprive the world of its last hope. We shall rob mankind of its last chance.

Harry Emerson Fosdick

Main

ABOUT 4000

IN REPLYING to the question proposed by The Christian Century, "If America is drawn into war, can you, as a Christian, participate in it or support it?" my answer must be, No!

As I understand the matter, this inquiry is to be taken as intimate and personal. I am not asked to discuss in the abstract "absolute" and "doctrinaire" pacifism, concerning which I should have to be critical. I am not asked what I would do were I a Chinese or an Englishman, although the answer may be implied in what I say. I am not asked what I would do were I a layman of draft age. If I understand myself I should be a conscientious objector, asking for alternative civilian service, the harder the better.

The question which is proposed faces me, a minister of Christ in the United States today, with the practical inquiry: If this nation now becomes an active belligerent will I support the war?

In answering I propose mainly to present my minimal position, the place where no matter how urgent the national necessities may seem to be, I know I must take my stand. That minimal position seems clear: I can never use my Christian ministry in the support and sanction of war.

During the last war I did so use my ministry. I was ready to declare war, as some of my brethren are today, even

before the nation was. I, a minister of Christ, went all out for the backing of the fray, and was proud when, in France, after an address to the troops, an officer told me I was worth a battalion. To be sure, it cost a struggle. The whole business of war, the causes that produce it, the processes that characterize it, the moral consequences that accompany it, are too obviously the denial of everything that Jesus taught, for a minister easily to fit Christ into a military uniform. I twisted and turned every which way to harmonize war and the Christian ethic, preaching against hate, praying for the Germans, and arguing beautifully about the way we could slaughter them in the spirit of love. My rationalizations in trying to make that oil and water mix arouse my wonder at their ingenuity and my shame at their futility, and the crux of my regret is that I so used my Christian ministry, as though such holloaing after the dogs of war were the function of the church of Christ.

Today when I picture Christ in this warring world I can see him in one place only, not arrayed in the panoply of battle on either side, but on his judgment seat, sitting in condemnation on all of us—aggressor, defender, neutral—who by our joint guilt have involved ourselves in a way of life that denies everything he stood for. The function of the church is to keep him there, above the strife, representing a manner of living, the utter antithesis of war, to which mankind must return if we are to have any hope. But the Christian ministry does not keep him there by throwing itself, generation after generation, into the support and sanction of the nation's wars. Rather it drags him down, until the people, listening, can feel little if any difference between what Christ says and what Mars wants. It is not the function of the Christian church to help win a war. A church that becomes an adjunct to a war department has

denied its ministry. The function of the church is to keep Christ where he belongs, upon his judgment seat, condemner of our joint guilt, chastener of impenitent pride, guide to our only hope.

This does not mean that in the present world-wide conflict I am neutral. These last months I have sometimes thought I lived more in Britain and China than at home, so keen have been my sympathies, so deep my apprehensions, so desperate my hopes. Obviously it makes a difference to us which side wins. The Christian minister, maintaining the position for which I plead, lives in no ivory tower apart from the realistic facts, but under terrific tension, with a warring world on one side, in which his personal emotions and his nation's interests are involved, and with Christ upon the other; but he accepts the *tension*, and does not try to resolve it by reducing Christ to the level of the warring world.

This does not mean that I am uncritical of pacifism as it sometimes is presented. Some pacifists seem to me to drift unwittingly into philosophical anarchism, denying the rightful functions of the state, blind to the incalculable benefits that arise when private force is supplanted by public force for the good of all, falsely resting their case on opposition to all force rather than on a distinction between salutary and diabolical uses of it, and unrealistic about the necessities of social coercion, whether through municipal police or through international police when a world government has been created. Some pacifism seems to me merely individualistic and negative, as though a few individuals, refusing the fight, were the solution of the peace problem, when only a federation of the nations, a unified world order, can present an ultimate substitute for war.

Some pacifists seem to me far too complacent, as though by refusing any part in war themselves, they washed their hands of the common guilt that involves us all, from the burden of whose consequence the conscientious soldier feels he cannot ask exemption. And some pacifism becomes mere passiveness, as though one who let himself be a doormat for aggressive evil to wipe its feet on were really a peace-maker, whereas to be *that* always involves a whole battery of positive moral qualities issuing from creative good will, and commonly involves obdurate, sacrificial resistance to evil, even if violent means are eschewed.

Yet, while I am neither neutral nor a contented absolutist in my pacifism, I come back to my position, sure that I must maintain it: I will not prostitute the ministry of Jesus Christ to the sanction and support of war.

In this position a conviction is involved concerning the meaning of Christ's life and teaching. That the spirit, methods, processes, accompaniments and results of war are the complete denial of Jesus' ethic, that war stands for everything he was against, and against everything he was for, seems to me clear. Surely, the least we can do is to say with the Oxford Conference: "War involves compulsory enmity, diabolical outrage against human personality and a wanton distortion of the truth. War is a particular demonstration of the power of sin in this world, and a defiance of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and him crucified."

Whether one studies the texts in detail—read, for example, MacGregor's *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism*—or considers the whole bent and meaning of Jesus' teaching and his way of life, the endeavor to harmonize him with war seems to me impossible. If nothing else persuaded me

to be a pacifist, I think I should be persuaded by the sophisticated rationalizations, the wishful twisting of texts out of contexts, the dreadful perversions of Jesus' most characteristic teaching, by which the churchly supporters of war try to get Christ to be their yes-man.

I can indeed understand one who, seeing no possibility of compromise between Christ's ethic and war, says frankly that Christ's ethic is at present inapplicable, that it represents an ideal hope, not a program of present action. That, at least, is a clear-headed facing of the issue involved in a Christian's decision about war, and is a candid surrender of Jesus' way of life as a guide to conduct. But it leads to the substitution of theology, ecclesiasticism or ritualism for the spirit and teaching of Christ, and its outcome Westermarck correctly described in his *Christianity and Morals*: "War is the rock on which Christian principles have suffered the most miserable shipwreck." Full of sympathy, as one must be, with men and nations in this brutal world who see no possibility of being ethically Christian in their desperate emergencies, surely the Christian minister has no right to lower his flag. This agelong conflict, this head-on collision, between war and the ethic of Jesus, will not be resolved by the abject surrender of Christ's representatives every time that war comes on.

Involved in this position, along with such conviction regarding Christ's spirit and way of life, is a factual judgment about this present situation. I have said that it makes a difference to us who wins this war, but how much difference it makes has yet to be decided. We, the democracies, with smashing completeness won the last war. We had the world in our hands and could do what we would. As to what we did and did not do, the bill of particulars has

often been written, and the all but unanimous judgment seems to be that we, the democracies, are just as responsible for the rise of the dictators as the dictatorships themselves, and perhaps more so.

Even President Butler, of Columbia University, says: "That great war, with all its terrible sacrifice of life, of the comfort and happiness of tens of millions of human beings and of the world's savings for generations, was absolutely futile."

In that outcome to war, even when democracies win it, there is nothing unique. When we moderns begin a war we no longer "draw the sword," but rather start a forest fire that stops at nothing, spares nobody, destroys everything, creates naught but havoc. With Europe and Asia devastated, with famine and pestilence awaiting their terrible innings, with economic prostration and social revolution trailing after them, and with Stalin hoping to become the residuary legatee of a ruined continent, it is still an open question what anybody's "winning" of this war may mean. But it is not an open question that if any creative consequence is to be snatched from the havoc, it will come from such spiritual forces as may still be left intact.

Do we Christians really believe that? Does not that fact create the special function of the church? This gospel of Christ, which in wartime we are tempted to compromise, postpone as too ideal for present application, put into cold storage or quite explicitly deny, is really the hope of the world. Should not the Christian ministry keep that fact central? What business has the minister throwing the weight of his influence on the side of war? What place in the Christian economy have sermons entitled "To Arms! To Arms!"?

My personal judgment is that for the United States to

become a belligerent in this conflict would be a colossal and futile disaster and, along with millions of others, I should hold that judgment, pacifist or no pacifist. What if, however, the United States were invaded? That, I think, is not a practical possibility and never has been, but it is continually presented as a test case to those who do not propose to use their ministry in support of war. What would we do in case of invasion? My own answer is clear: resist, whether by violent or non-violent means.

The identification of pacifism with mere submissiveness is a familiar misunderstanding. Denmark is used as an example of pacifism. That seems to me a case of mistaken identity. Denmark, under necessity, submitted. Gandhi, however, has never submitted, but has organized tireless, incorrigible, courageous, non-violent resistance. I profoundly admire him, and venture to predict a long and influential future for his ideas and methods. If, however, someone says that, under present circumstances, to rely on America's meeting invasion with a mass movement of non-violent resistance is trusting moonshine, I agree. America is utterly unprepared for such a process. When I hear that plan proposed as a realistic alternative to armed resistance in the United States today, I am entirely incredulous. Even Gandhi, with his long training of his people in his ideas and techniques, would face a brand new problem if, in Winston Churchill's ominous words, Hitler should "stand at the gates of India."

Nevertheless, non-violent resistance—tireless, incorrigible refusal of participation in tyranny and of subjection to it—is today one of the major hopes of Europe in countries like Norway, Holland, Belgium. At least when military resistance breaks down and a nation faces the choice between submission on the one side and, on the other, the pacifist method—obstinate, courageous, non-violent resistance—the

latter can determine the course of history, and those who are at work on its basic ideas and practical methods are about important business.

If our country were invaded, therefore, I should say resist, each according to his best conscience, by violent or non-violent means. The pacifists have not been dubious or mealy-mouthed about this matter. Muriel Lester quotes with approval the assertion of Gandhi that it is better to fight than to do nothing. Leyton Richards, one of the leading pacifist ministers of England in both the last war and this one, says: "If a man has not seized the significance of the Christian reaction to aggressive evil as seen in the way of Jesus, it is better to react by way of war than not to act at all." And A. J. Muste, who is a pacifist if ever there was one, writes: "Personally, I believe that resistance to evil and oppression, even if it takes a violent form, is on a higher moral plane than cowardly or passive acquiescence."

Nevertheless, even in case of invasion, I should hold to my position. Honoring the consciences of all who resist aggressive evil whether by violent or non-violent means, trying in the church I serve to minister alike to the needs of the conscientious objector and the conscientious soldier, all the more in such a crisis I should try to keep Christ where he belongs—on his judgment seat, above the strife, standing for a way of life that condemns both aggressor and defender, and offers the only hope of salvation from their joint guilt and their insensate brutality. I will not use my Christian ministry to bless war.

To be sure, I distrust the judgment of any man so contented with his attitude in this complicated crisis that he thinks he has escaped inconsistency. We pacifists need humbly to confess that we are deeply involved in the war

system and cannot pretend that we purely wash our hands of it. Like a socialist fighting the profit system who is at leisure to do so because he owns stock on whose profits he can live, so, like everyone else, we are inextricably entangled in the very war system we disclaim and are trying to displace.

We say we will not support war, but we do support it in every tax we pay, and we have no intention of imitating Thoreau's inane refusal. We know that vast armaments are essentially anti-Christian, and yet we know too that disarmament can never be unilateral, that when disarmament comes it must come by mutual international agreement, and so we have habitually taken our national army and navy for granted and now take for granted their inevitable enlargement. We see clearly that a war for democracy is a contradiction in terms, that war itself is democracy's chief enemy, and that after every world war, whoever wins it, there is bound to be less democracy than there was before, yet we see too that the military victory of Hitler is the worse of two evils, that American bombing planes going to Britain may give democracy at least a breathing space, and may conceivably save us here from plunging into active belligerency.

Moreover, sure as we are that we stand for convictions which in the long run are the world's hope, we nonetheless recognize that in the immediate emergency were our attitude to become predominant and controlling on one side of the battle line and not on the other, the worse of two evils might temporarily be strengthened by the very stand that so conscientiously we take.

If the pacifist finds himself so involved in difficulty, the Christian who supports war, and especially the Christian minister who throws his influence as Christ's representative

into the waging of war, seems to me utterly distraught by self-contradiction. Christ and the bombing of civilians, the Sermon on the Mount and the starving of whole populations, every essential element in the gospel on one side, and on the other every "diabolical outrage against human personality"—it may be difficult to choose between them, but what can one say about trying to amalgamate them?

Let the Christian non-pacifist get this matter down out of the abstract into the concrete, stripped of the sentimental romanticism with which once more the "glory of war" is being clothed, and let him see war as it actually is! In the last war an officer drilling a group of boys in the use of the bayonet said this: "You've got to get down and hook them out with a bayonet; you will enjoy that, I assure you. Get sympathy out of your head. We go out to kill. We don't care how so long as they are killed. . . . And I say to you, if you see a wounded German, shove him out and have no nonsense about it. . . . Kill them, every mother's son of them. Remember that your job is to kill them—that is the only way—exterminate the vile creatures." That, along with innumerable things like that, on a scale more terrible than any previous conflict knew, *is* war, and when a minister of Christ supports war, that is what he is supporting.

Well aware of the difficulties of my own position, I watch with deep concern the endeavors of Christian ministers to subsume war under Christian categories. A sermon lies before me in which the preacher urges that because God sends men to hell—an obviously coercive process!—therefore Christians may use violence in war. All the way from *that* the devious arguments range to and fro, and up and down, until I find one eminent and fine-spirited preacher, laboring with the text, "God is love," who concludes that bombing

planes can be one expression of the divine compassion and that "men may be forced at times, *in the service of love* [the italics are his], to use weapons which strike down the innocent as well as the guilty." Am I wrong in being horrified at that?

Whichever side a man espouses, let him not suppose he can extricate himself from inconsistency! Humility becomes us all. Nevertheless, facing the choice between the two, I think I see where the clearer ground is and the better hope of maintaining our Christian testimony unimpaired.

Meanwhile, to the limit of our ability, let us keep our Christian fellowship intact. Dr. Tittle is right: "Christian fellowship cannot survive internationally unless it survives locally. It cannot possibly be maintained in the ends of the earth unless it is maintained in the church on the corner." As the crisis thickens this will grow more difficult; in some cases it will doubtless be impossible; some churches will be torn asunder by the war-psychosis and some ministers will lose their pulpits. Hard as it is to discover the truly Christian position in this crisis, it is often harder to maintain it in a Christian spirit when one thinks one has found it. I see letters written by Christian pacifists to their non-pacifist brethren that for bitterness, acrimony, venom and dogmatism pass all decent bounds; and I see statements made by Christian non-pacifists about their pacifist fellows that for scorn, misrepresentation, rancor and contemptuousness are appalling. There is no hope in such a spirit. Unless we Christians can maintain humility, a joint penitence, good will, and a sincere respect for one another's consciences within our churches, we cannot help the world much in maintaining such attitudes, without which we and the world alike are doomed.

Nevertheless, if the issue is drawn, some of us will have

to abide by the consequences. We will not use our Christian ministry to support war. As for myself, I am essentially a Quaker, and my convictions belong in what seems to me the great tradition of the Society of Friends.

Charles A. Lindbergh

A LETTER TO AMERICANS

I ADDRESS this letter to every man and woman in America who is opposed to our country's entry into the European war. I write because we are being led toward that war with ever-increasing rapidity and by every conceivable subterfuge. While our leaders have shouted for peace, they have constantly directed us toward war, until even now we are seriously involved.

I write to ask your immediate aid in maintaining the independent American destiny our forefathers established. I write to warn you that the men who entice us on to war have no more idea of how that war can be won than the governments of France and England had when they declared war on Germany. The interventionists call on us to fight, and then their responsibility ends. They offer no feasible plan for victory.

The situation in America today is alarmingly similar to that of France and England in the years prior to this war. There, as here, people let their emotions get the better of their judgment; and they had the same unwillingness to face realities. Both countries had refused to take part in a European readjustment while there was still time to make it peacefully. Both had refused to make the sacrifice that was essential for adequate rearmament. They, too, had cultivated the philosophy that it was necessary to defend someone else in order to defend themselves. How they could

defend anyone else if they were unable to defend themselves, they apparently did not consider any more than we are considering today.

Their failure is now obvious, and stands out clearly before us. The imposition of "sanctions" did not save Abyssinia; but it threw Italy into the arms of Germany and sowed the seeds for the Axis. The threat of war by England and France did not save Poland; but it forced Germany and Russia into an alliance and precipitated a disastrous war. Adjustments that should have been made in peace and moderation were finally brought by war and resulted in immoderation. The failure to face realities in peace brought the curse of war on Europe. The failure to face the realities of war brought defeat to France and devastation to England.

When the last war ended, the victorious Allies had two courses open to them. They could either have assisted Germany back onto her feet as a self-respecting nation, or they could have kept her in a weakened condition by the use of military force. But they followed neither of these policies. England and France wavered back and forth between the two, while the United States withdrew her armies and her politics to the Western Hemisphere—avowedly forever.

During the years immediately succeeding the last war, Germany was held down with an iron heel. The terms of Versailles were the terms of a military victory, and when Germany defaulted on her payment of reparations, French troops occupied the Ruhr. But during the following two decades, England decided to disarm, while France allowed the equipment of her army to become obsolete for modern warfare. Then Germany broke the terms of Versailles, re-armed and marched her troops back into the Rhineland.

When this happened, a few men in France and England, with greater vision than the rest, cried out that Germany must be stopped then, or that it would be forever too late. Their statements were met with popular indifference.

During the most active years of German rearmament, France and England exerted relatively little effort to compete. It seemed impossible for them to realize what was taking place in Central Europe. But later, after Germany had trained her armies, built her air force and constructed the Siegfried Line, the demand grew in France and England for military action—a demand which culminated in the declaration of war of 1939, and which has already caused the defeat of France and the devastation of England. While there was still time to fight, populace and politician refused to let the armies move. When the time to fight had passed, the armies were forced into a hopeless battle.

I sat in England, one afternoon in 1938, listening to the man who had charge of co-ordinating defense for the British government. I had pleaded with him to take additional steps to safeguard the British position in aviation. I had told him that if this were not done Germany would soon become as supreme in the air as England was at sea. He listened courteously, and then replied that if the wars in Spain and China had demonstrated one thing, it was that the danger of air bombardment, and the damage which could be inflicted by bombing planes, had been grossly exaggerated. He said that the British aviation program was being "adequately expanded."

A few months later, at the time of the Munich crisis, I went to see one of the foremost leaders of England. I went at the request of other English leaders, to tell him my belief that the strength of German aviation was underestimated

in England, and that the strength of Russian aviation was almost as much overestimated. He did not agree with me, although he admitted that the situation was serious. While I was there, however, he showed me an official report concerning British anti-aircraft units. The report stated that not enough anti-aircraft guns existed in all England to form an adequate defense for the city of London alone. Yet that man at that moment was advocating war.

At the time of Munich, the Royal Air Force had only a few squadrons of modern fighters and bombers. The majority of their planes were obsolete. And all of them put together totaled a fraction of the German air force. The condition of French aviation was even more deplorable. There was not a single squadron in France equipped with modern pursuit planes, and the French government was *looking forward* to the time when its aircraft production would reach a total of 200 fighting planes per month.

When I returned to Paris after a flight to Russia, in the fall of 1938, I met, at his request, one of the members of the French cabinet. I gave him my estimate of the Russian and German air forces, telling him of the tremendous expansion of military aviation that had taken place in Germany, and that Russian aviation had been unable to keep pace. He replied that my estimates confirmed the worst fears of the French, and corresponded to the reports of an air mission they had recently sent to Germany. I found that aviation circles in France, at that time, freely admitted that Germany would take supremacy of the air almost as soon as a war started.

From the standpoint of logic, the aviation situation in Europe was in itself sufficient reason to prevent a declaration of war by France and England in 1939. But when one looked farther, he found that the same conditions existed

in relation to the ground armies of Europe. Even the civilian population of Germany had been trained and prepared for war, while the people in France and England were not.

One of the striking differences between France and England, during the months immediately preceding this war, lay in the fact that France was alert to her danger but disorganized; while England was organized but only half awake. In France, internal conditions were so bad that I often wondered whether war or revolution would break upon the country first. In England, there was no danger of revolution, but the people of that nation had never adjusted themselves to the tempo of this modern era. Their minds were still attuned to the speed of sail rather than to that of aircraft. The way of life in England was ideal for times of peace, but fatal for a modern war. In Germany, on the other hand, one found a nation that had arisen from the prostration of a previous defeat—a nation less tolerant, less satisfied, than its neighbors; a nation fully trained for war, and nurtured on the philosophy that right is inseparable from might.

The true facts of the European situation had been hidden from the people of England and France. They were not adequately informed either of Germany's strength or of their own weakness. Politicians and idealists harangued them about stopping aggression, about defending freedom and democracy, about maintaining their way of life, but the realities of modern warfare—the elements that spell failure or success—were seldom discussed. The orators shouted: "We must stop Hitler." The newspapers echoed: "Down with the Nazi regime." The people of France and England resigned themselves to the inevitability of war. But not a single man told how to break the Siegfried Line.

I can best illustrate the attitude in the democracies of

Europe by telling you of a conversation I had one evening with a French businessman on the outskirts of Paris. He had been talking for nearly an hour about the inevitability of war, and why German aggression must be stopped. He advocated a declaration of war by France.

"What would your first move be?" I asked him.

"We must fight the Germans," he replied.

"But how?" I asked him. "Do you think the French army can break the Siegfried Line?"

He looked startled, then sank back into his chair. "Oh, I don't know about that," he answered. "That's up to the military men."

A week or two later, I was having lunch with one of those military men—a general in the French army. I asked him if he felt that the Siegfried Line could be broken.

"No," he replied, "I don't think so." And then added: "But if it could, the cost would be too high."

"What's the answer then?" I asked, for the war drums were beating loudly.

He shrugged his shoulders. "If only they had let us attack when we wanted to," he said. "When we could have won, the people would not fight. And now, when we cannot win, they want war."

France waited until it was too late. England waited until it was too late. We in America have waited until it is too late; and yet we step closer and closer to the war, as though hypnotized by its bombing and its fury. Like France and England in 1939, we are unprepared today. We have not as many thoroughly modern fighting planes in our Army and Navy combined as Germany produces in a single week; and our Army is deplorably lacking in such essential items as tanks and antitank cannon. We have not made the sacrifice

necessary for adequate rearmament. We, too, have cultivated the philosophy that it is essential to defend someone else in order to defend ourselves. *Our* politicians and idealists harangue *us* about defending freedom and democracy, and our way of life. *They* are now shouting, "We must stop Hitler." *Our* newspapers echo, "Down with the Nazi regime." But not one feasible plan has been offered us for an invasion of the continent of Europe. With the disaster of France and England fresh before us, we are following the selfsame path.

We, in America, are being led to war by a group of interventionists, and foreign interests, against the will of a majority of our people. Every poll of public opinion has shown that from 80 per cent to 95 per cent of Americans are opposed to entering this war. Both the Republican and Democratic parties were forced to incorporate antiwar planks in their platforms. Both presidential candidates were compelled to take a stand against our intervention. Yet today, although no one has made an attempt to attack us, we already have one foot in the war. We have even now entangled "our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor and caprice."

What has happened to us? How was this condition brought about? The procedure has not been dissimilar to that which took us into the last war. When hostilities in Europe began, it was fully realized by the foreign interests and interventionists in this country that the great majority of Americans stood firmly opposed to entering the conflict. These interventionists knew that it was useless for them to advocate openly a declaration of war by America. They therefore adopted a more subtle plan. They believed that while the people of the United States would not agree to a

declaration of war, we could be beguiled into supporting steps that would inevitably lead to war. Consequently, instead of advocating war, they advocated steps which they called "short of war"—steps which have already entangled us, and which will leave us no alternative to war if we continue to take them. The policy of the interventionists has been, from the beginning, to support every movement that would lead us in the direction of war, and to oppose every movement that would not—always under their mask of "aid short of war." I have listened more than once to interventionists in America discuss the question of what steps "short of war" would take us into war most quickly.

To be specific, soon after war was declared in Europe, the interventionists advocated, and obtained, the revision of our Neutrality Act. They persuaded us that we could sell arms on a "cash and carry" basis without becoming involved in the war ourselves. They were emphatic in saying that no one asked us to lend money, or to send troops abroad. Their next step "short of war" was the demand that aircraft, cannon, destroyers and other munitions be taken from the American Army, Navy and Air Corps, and transferred to the French and British forces in Europe. In this, too, we acquiesced. Then we began to hear it whispered that we were already too far in the war to back out—whispered by the very people who had advocated the steps "short of war" which involved us. Now we are told that we have not done enough; that there must be no limit to our assistance; that we must be the "arsenal of democracy" for the entire world, lending, leasing or giving all the resources of our nation, if necessary, to the cause of the British empire. (And here it is interesting to note that the cause of the British empire does not prevent us, as the "arsenal of democracy," from supplying arms to Russia, though she be both an aggressor

nation and a totalitarian state.) The advocates of intervention are beginning to forget the qualifying phrase "short of war." The more daring among them are openly discussing an American Expeditionary Force for Europe.

Along with steps "short of war" has gone a supporting campaign of propaganda. Our country has been full of it for many months—a propaganda as subtle, insidious and effective to date as that which led us into the last war. Before we entered the war in 1917 we were told, as we are being told today, that American troops would not be needed. Then, after we declared war, we were asked for a "token" division to fight in Europe. But we ended up with more than 2,000,000 soldiers overseas, and a war debt that has not yet been paid.

British propaganda in the United States attempts to persuade us that Great Britain will win the war, provided she receives somewhat more help than we have, up to this moment, given her. Coupled with this has been a campaign to convince us that a British victory is essential to American security. It is taken for granted that we would not be willing to take part in a war which we felt would be unsuccessful. Consequently, news releases from London minimize all German successes and exaggerate all British successes. They avoid any discussion of war aims, peace terms or how England can win now that Germany has defeated France and controls the continent of Europe. This is simply the ABC of wartime propaganda. It is carried on by both sides in a war. I am discussing British propaganda because it is that to which we have been subjected and therein lies the danger of our involvement. There is certainly no danger of our fighting on Germany's side, and her propaganda in America has been relatively ineffective.

To be specific again, you will remember that even before hostilities commenced, factual statements concerning the growing military strength of Germany were bitterly attacked by the pro-British press. Those of us who saw the growth of the German air force were severely assailed because of the reports we made describing it, although these reports now turn out to have been almost unforgivably conservative. Then, you recall that when the Germans invaded Austria, it was claimed by the propagandists that their mechanized divisions broke down; that the workmanship on their tanks, trucks, engines, etc., was too inferior to operate successfully in a major war. German aircraft were said to be weakly constructed; there was a shortage of pilots, raw materials and fuel. We were told that Germany did not have sufficient food to wage a war. And in addition to all this, internal conditions were said to be so bad that the German people would start a revolution rather than fight again.

If you question the accuracy of my statement that we have been misinformed through propaganda, I ask you to glance through our daily newspapers since the war began. If you are pressed for time, take any one of the major campaigns—Poland, Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium and France. You will find that we, in America, were misinformed about these campaigns until the actual military position made it impossible to hide the facts any longer. Do you remember when we were informed over the radio that the French army had penetrated the Siegfried Line in five different places? Do you recall the headlines of battles raging on the western front during the winter of 1939-40—battles we now know were never fought? Were we told how desperate the Finnish position was before the final break-

through of the Russian army? Do you remember how, after reading day after day of Allied successes in Norway, and how Germany had put her neck in a noose, we were startled by the announcement that the Allies were evacuating all of their forces? Who was it said the Maginot Line was impregnable; that bombing planes were no match for the British navy; that England had the submarine menace well in hand, and had already "won the battle of the air"?

The propagandists who made these claims do not bother to explain them. They know that people forget quickly, and they are too busy leading us along with new fallacies. They must confuse America's desire to aid England with our desire to stay out of the war. They must convince our people that England is winning the war in Europe, even though she has lost every major engagement in which she participated—that all she needs is more help than we have, up to that moment, given her; and that if we *should* get into the war, it would not be necessary to send troops. They must build up the element of fear in America. They must persuade us that if England loses, we are not strong enough to defend ourselves; that we may be invaded by aircraft from the Greenland ice cap, or even by transatlantic parachute troops descending on our city streets. They have already led us far along the road to war—the same road that we traveled in 1917; then, too, at their behest.

But there is one all-important difference between the European war when we entered it in 1917, and the European war today. It is this difference which must be brought to the attention of every American, for the entire future of our nation hangs upon it. It is that when we entered the last war we could see how victory could be won, but today we cannot. In 1917, the Central Powers were fighting France and Great Britain in the west, Russia in the east,

and Italy in the south. The German armies had already suffered severe reverses. Even Japan had entered the war on the Allied side.

In 1941, however, we face an entirely different situation. Germany has conquered France. She has an alliance with Italy, Russia and Japan—three hundred million people. Her armies control the coast of Europe from Spain to the Arctic Ocean. British shipping losses are already of the utmost seriousness, and the major ports and industrial centers of England have been heavily bombed.

The fact is that America is not in a position to wage a successful war in Europe under present conditions. We, ourselves, are not prepared, and even if we were, where would we send our soldiers to fight? How are we to force a landing on the European continent against the prepared positions of the strongest military power in the world? If the British, French and Belgian armies combined could not hold the fortifications they had spent years in building along the German border, how can we be expected to cross the Atlantic Ocean and invade the continent of Europe against the opposition of the same army, navy and air force that thrust the British fleet from the coast of Norway and broke the Maginot Line?

The people who shouted for England and France to declare war in 1939 called for suicide and defeat. Because of their hysteria and blindness, the bravest men of France and England marched to disaster and to death. While the intellectuals of Europe preached of Christianity, democracy and idealism, they threw a wave of human flesh against a fortified concrete line—without adequate guns, or tanks, or aircraft even for defense, to say nothing of attack.

Has this attitude of life succeeded? Has it gained freedom for France or security for England? Has it stamped out

aggression or heightened civilization? Has democracy gained or has it lost through such leadership? These are questions that we in America must answer. With failure in Europe before our eyes, shall we follow this same course? Shall we throw ourselves into war in a fervor of idealism, shouting about how we think the world *should* be run? Or shall we discuss calmly how our objectives can be accomplished, and *adequately* prepare ourselves to reach them?

Personally, I believe that by our withdrawal from Europe after the last war, and our failure to prepare for this one many years ago, we are already committed to a policy of military isolation. I believe that if we abandon this policy at the present time, we are courting national disaster, just as France and England courted disaster when they, unprepared, declared war over the German invasion of Poland. A nation cannot change overnight from an attitude of peace to an attitude of war. It takes many years of planning and preparation before great military strength can be attained. I believe it is not any longer a question of what we *wish* to do in this war, but rather one of what we *can* do. I believe that for us to enter the conflict in Europe at this time would result in defeat and humiliation. If we are to enter such a conflict successfully, then we must prepare for it not for one year or for two, but for ten years or for twenty as Germany has done.

On the other hand, I believe that we can build a military and commercial position on this continent that is impregnable to attack, and which will force other nations to trade with us, if through expediency alone. Even if America intended eventually to dominate the entire world, as some people now seem to want us to do, I would say that our first step should be to consolidate our defenses at home, so that

we could prepare ourselves in safety for our adventures beyond the seas.

Every difficulty we would have in invading Europe would be an advantage for us in defending America. Our armies would be fighting on home soil, our Navy would be close to its bases, our air force could strike with its utmost effect. It would be the enemy's problem, not ours, to cross the ocean with millions of troops and their supplies, to pass by our submarines, our battleships, and our bombing planes, and to force a landing on American shores against the guns of our coast artillery and our Army.

When England could not hold the coast of Norway against the German Air Force; when the British Navy dared not remain in the Skagerrak, or even permanently in the North Sea; when the German military machine, after crashing through the Maginot Line and routing the French Army and the British expeditionary force, has been held up for nine months by twenty-five miles of English Channel—how is any navy to approach the shores of America and land an invading army against the combined resistance of our military forces?

There has been much discussion of an air invasion of America. This is partially due to propaganda, partially to hysteria and partially, I believe, to a misconception of the so-called "air invasions" of Norway and Holland by the German Air Force. Personally, although I think the effectiveness of military aviation is still underestimated, I do not believe there is the slightest danger of a purely air invasion of America now, or at any time we can now foresee. To begin with, the distance across the oceans is far too great to permit the air transport of armies large enough to invade us successfully, even if one assumes that they had a place to land unopposed by our own military forces. But,

aside from the question of distance, we should be reassured by the fact that there has never been a successful invasion by air alone. The outstanding examples of the use of aviation for invasion of enemy territory occurred during the German occupations of Norway and Holland. But in each of these instances, the landing of troops by air was carried on simultaneously with the movement of ground and naval forces on a major scale. The maximum number of troops that could have been transported and supplied by air would have been ineffective without the immediate support of a ground army. If air invasion alone could be successful, it would have been used by the Germans against England many months ago.

But what about the northern routes, cry the alarmists; won't we be invaded by way of Greenland and Alaska, where the distances between land are short? Possibly the best answer to this question is in the form of another: Why, if these northern routes are so advantageous, do you suppose the commercial airlines to Europe and Asia prefer the great overwater distances farther south? The answer is that ice and fog and bitter cold still force men southward in their quests of commerce and of war. Except in adventure and exploration, men follow the routes which offer the greatest safety and require the least effort—and these are not in the north.

Of all the transatlantic air routes, the simplest to fly is the one that lies between Africa and South America. This fact is being used today in much of the war propaganda we hear. German airplanes, we are told, will fly to Africa by the thousands, hop across the ocean to South America, refuel and fly up and invade the United States.

Leaving aside the problems that would have to be solved in Europe and Africa before thousands of German airplanes

could take off on such a venture, let us consider what preparations would have to be made for their arrival in South America—in Brazil, to be specific. There would have to be dozens of previously prepared airdromes, equipped with tanks and fuel and crews of skilled mechanics. All of the men and supplies required would have to be transported by sea. In fact many ocean transports and tens of thousands of workmen would have to be busy for months before the necessary landing facilities could be arranged. So that when anyone speaks of an air invasion via Africa and South America, he presupposes that Germany has won the war in Europe; that the countries she has conquered are either so well satisfied or so completely subdued that she is able to devote her attention to an interhemisphere struggle (with Asia always at her back door); that she has Africa also well in hand; and finally that she has, in opposition to the armed forces of Brazil backed by our own Army, Navy and Air Corps, been able to construct and supply the necessary airdromes in eastern South America.

After that, of course, it is still farther from eastern Brazil to the continent of North America than it was from Germany originally, so other groups of air bases would have to be established, farther north, before enemy planes based in South America would have any advantage over enemy planes based on their home airports in Europe. And since there are no railroads through that portion of South America, these bases too would have to be established by sea.

No, the more one studies the problem, the more obvious it becomes that an air invasion of America is entirely out of the question. Invading forces would have to come by sea, and if they made such an attempt, it would be our American aviation that flew out to meet them and did the raiding.

Of all the nations in the world, we hold the most impregnable position of defense. We have highly developed industries, great national resources and a population of one hundred and thirty million people upon which to draw. There is not a nation in this hemisphere strong enough even to consider attacking us. We are flanked by the Atlantic Ocean on the east, and the Pacific on the west. In the north, we are protected by the wastelands of the Arctic. Where, in all history, has a nation been similarly blessed? Then why, in our maturity any more than in our youth, "Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor or caprice?"

It is often asked today why our rearmament program moves so slowly, why our people are so divided and confused. Why, indeed! The answer is clear. It is because we have neglected the wisdom and experience of our forefathers—we have not followed Washington's advice. We have let the destiny of America become confused and entangled with that of foreign lands. Our leaders have attempted to transfer loyalty to our own country to loyalty to a "part of Europe." One portion of our people has attempted to force its ideas about Europe upon another portion of our people—to inject into our midst today the very quarrels of the Old World that our forefathers left behind.

We, in America, should not be discussing whether we will enter the war that England declared in Europe. We should not be wasting our time arguing whether it is cheaper to defend someone else than to defend ourselves. We should not be conscripting our youth for a foreign war they do not wish to fight. We should all be marching together toward one clear and commonly accepted goal—the independent

destiny of America. If we desire unity and strength among our people, we must turn our eyes back from these everlasting wars of Europe—back to our own country, to the clear horizons of a great American future. Let us learn from the errors made by the democracies abroad, and not repeat them. Let us give thanks to the generations of Americans before us who won and maintained the independence of our nation against far greater dangers than we face today. Let us dedicate ourselves to guarding that independence that we may pass it on to the future in even greater security than we received it from the past. It is by building our own strength and character at home—not by crusading abroad—that we can contribute most to civilization throughout the world.

If you believe that we should not enter this war, your help is needed vitally by those of us who stand against our intervention. The policy of our nation is still influenced by the desires of its people. You can help us by organizing mass meetings against our entry into the war. You can help by attending such mass meetings. You can help by writing to your congressmen, to your senators and to your local newspaper, telling them of your views. Such letters have more influence than most people realize. But if you stand with us against war, you must act now or it will be forever too late. It is not enough to write once. Write every time an issue arises—several letters each week until this crisis has passed. Demand of your representatives that they oppose our entry into the war and be on guard against these steps that will inevitably lead us to it. It is worth all the effort we can give. Our future, our children's future, our country's future, all that we hold worth while is in the balance.

I have one last request, and then this letter is ended. Before you make your final decision, reason through for

yourself what war would mean to this country. Demand a practical plan from those who preach of defending democracy throughout the world. Ask them to explain how we are to invade successfully the continent of Europe—how we are to impose our ideology on the peoples of Germany, Russia, Italy and Japan combined against us. Insist on an answer that is clear—couched in terms of soldiers killed and years of war. Stop them from telling you what *should be done*, and make them demonstrate to you what we have the *ability to do*. Ask them to define our war aims, our plan of defense and of attack. And if someone says that such questions must be left to “experts,” ask them: To what experts? To the same experts who, for the last twenty years, led France to defeat and England to ruin? To the same experts who have created the greatest national debt in American history, and still left us a nation unprepared in the midst of a world at war? To the same experts who failed either to maintain peace or to prepare for war? No, such leadership will never make us a strong and victorious nation. It will not carry us successfully through these periods of war and crises. If our American ideals are to survive, it will not be through the narcotic of a foreign war, but through a reawakening of the spirit that brought this nation into existence. It will be only if you, and I, and people like us, take the reins in hand once more, as our forefathers have done in times of crisis.

The future of America, of our way of life and of western civilization itself lies not so much in the outcome of these wars abroad as in the action that *we* take *now* here in our own country. In this action, your help is urgently and immediately needed.

Henry Noble MacCracken

A PERSONAL VIEW

"KILL," cry the clergymen. "Spend," urge the economists. "Starve," say the social workers. "Sacrifice," plead the old men. "Work," bid the employers. "Pay," says labor.

Sounds like a world turned upside down, doesn't it? But all this talk is rather banal when one has determined on war. Such things as these we know must be to gain a famous victory. How did we get this way? For twenty years we have been assuring ourselves that what went on overseas was none of our business. Most of those who are now shouting loudest for war were in a peace parade a few years ago. Why did we reject the League of Nations if we wanted to assume the role of defender of democracy? Why do nothing when China was invaded, or Abyssinia, or Czechoslovakia? The whole question comes down to this: Is this our war, or not? Those who believe that it is our war act upon two premises. The first is that Britain's battle is the battle of democracy against its opposing ideologies. The second is that the defense of Britain is an insurance against war reaching our shores.

Everything follows from these premises, but I cannot convince myself that either is true, or, if true, that it excludes alternatives. My sympathies, of course, are with Britain. My sympathies were with Poland, too, and with Finland, with China, and with Syria. My sympathies are with India at the present time. In fact, one man and one

people are about as good as another in the matter of sympathy. But until the United States is willing to enter the World League, and to contribute to the police power of that League in proportion to its wealth and population, I still believe that a strong America is the one best defense of the things which I hope will survive.

What were the motives that induced France and Britain to make war on Germany? The most important, I suppose, was the complete misapprehension of the strength and unity of Germany, and over-confidence in their own military strength. But even more important, no doubt, was the conviction which had been forced upon them that each victory of Hitler made him a stronger and more dangerous enemy, and that neither empire could survive if Hitler and his ally took the Balkans and the Near East. In any case, self-defense was the sole motive. It was not in any sense a battle of democracy. It was rather a struggle of the great maritime colonial empires against a great new continental force. The converse was the case in Asia. Here a great new maritime empire assaulted a weak continental power in order to secure mastery within its region.

The doctrine of insurance so widely promulgated now sounds rather fishy in view of the history of America's relations with the League of Nations. Proper implementation of that League and maintenance of the prestige of the World Court would have been the best possible insurance. The implementation of the League of Nations implies reconsideration of national frontiers along ethnic lines, extension of the principle of mandates to other imperial colonies than those won in the war, the promise of self-government to such colonies, and modification of the Peace Treaty in the interest of lasting peace. The prestige of the World Court would have been maintained by constant reference

to the Court of questions involved in these readjustments. But none of these things was done. The United States after refusing to sign the Treaty of Versailles reversed itself and joined the maritime empires in an effort to make the worst provisions of the peace work. The result was failure. Fifteen billions of debt and interest were repudiated, and many more hundreds of millions wasted in the effort. In effect, we threw all our insurance policies into the Atlantic.

Let us consider for a moment the possibility of a German victory. I see no use in closing our eyes to the sight of such a catastrophe. Those who think we should enter the war now believe that Britain's fleet would be surrendered, that a fascist government would be set up in Great Britain, that we should face a hostile fascist world. If such should happen, we should have to face the loss of all our contributed ships and destroyers, which would then be used against us. But such a hypothesis seems to me to leave out the self-governing dominions of Great Britain. The chances are rather that the fleet will choose to retire to its bases in Canada, South Africa, and Australia, and that India will be invited to remain in the empire on terms of full equality. The difficulty of attack against these islands, for the equatorial region in Africa, the Himalaya Mountains, and the deserts of Australia render them in effect islands, would be powerful deterrents to further invasion. The Balkans and the Mediterranean would probably change hands, but these are not, and never have been, the stronghold of democracy. Their conquest by the axis would be deplorable, but I do not see how the United States could prevent it. In the mean time, the countries of Europe which have had some taste of democracy, although suffering from oppressive tyranny, would probably by civil disobedience and other means maintain the struggle from within, and as the

years went on some return to democracy seems likely. After imperial Napoleon came a republic.

Let us suppose, on the other hand, that Britain and Germany wear themselves to exhaustion in the struggle. The result would be a consolidation of Europe for another assault, and viewing the numbers on each side and the geographical conditions, as well as the economic, I should not like to predict a further success of Britain.

Let us assume the complete victory of Britain over Germany without the exhaustion of Britain. Is it conceivable that bolshevist Russia with its unimpaired military and air forces would remain within the confines of its own frontier? Would it not advance over prostrate Germany much more rapidly than Britain, and thus insure a complete victory of European communism? In any case, I do not believe that fifty thousand American aeroplanes, or a hundred thousand American aeroplanes, can furnish the solution to the problem of Europe, with which Great Britain is unfortunately involved. That solution can only come from within Europe. A solution by American conquest would only bring another evil day.

Some will call this isolationist doctrine, but hard words break no bones. Until the world is again ready to consider the possibility of a world covenant, and a world court, America will do well to consider that its sphere is the western continents. Hemisphere defense is still possible, provided the United States remains strong, solvent, and just. The countries of South America all suspect our offer of a protecting hand, because we tie it with trade, and seem to be linked to the diplomacy of the maritime empires. If America still clings to the idea of a maritime alliance, and at the same time unbalances its credit to the point of bankruptcy, the idea of hemisphere defense will vanish. I am

a pacifist, it is true, but not to the point of non-resistance. I should still urge self-defense against actual aggression within the American hemisphere. I should arm so as to be ready for such aggression, but I see no permanent solution of the great continental problems of the world until each region has solved its problem for itself.

I shall be charged, too, with defeatism, but it seems to me that this is the lesson of history. Every entrance upon a career beyond regional development has raised new problems greater than the old. The colonial systems developed by the European powers have not, as it has turned out, been a solution to the problem either of European population, or of European economics. Only when, as in the case of the United States, an immigrant people cut the ties that bound them has there been something approaching a permanent solution. Even today, we are meshed into gear with the British Empire.

Something of all this, I think, was in the minds of our legislators who bade farewell to the hope of debt repayment, and passed their isolationist laws. The provisions of neutrality were included to prevent our embroilment. The acts against financial complications had the same intention. Embargoes were for the same purpose. Is all this machinery to be thrown overboard in behalf of Britain? What is the logic? How much of logic, and how much of fear? How much of ambition, the ambition that once again the United States shall be the determining factor in world politics, has entered the mind of those who answer yes? Theirs is a heavy responsibility.

For myself, I cannot so easily give up my lifelong beliefs. I do not look for their victory in my own time, but knowing that the wounds of memory are far deeper and more lasting than physical wounds, I cherish the hope that America will not add its bombers to the sum of world destruction.

Hugh S. Johnson

IS BRITAIN FIGHTING OUR WAR?

A RECENT New York *Times* dispatch from London summarized the British attitude toward us in some such way as this: "You—not we—insist that we are fighting your war. You say that, precisely as we hired and sent the Hessians to break George Washington and your Revolution, you are hiring us to defend you against a real and dangerous threat by the common enemy. You are hiring us by furnishing us with weapons—ships, planes, tanks, guns and munitions—and by promising us money and credit. Well, if that is so, we aren't getting our pay. It is up to you not only to pay for but also to deliver the goods—not on New York docks but here in England—to force them through Hitler's air and submarine blockade."

We have decided to pay for them but this "delivery" business is something else again.

Of course, as has been explained, it can't be done without involving us in total war. But if I had believed and said that Britain is "fighting our war," I wouldn't know how to answer that argument. In fact I would be ashamed to try. If Britain is fighting our war—defending our shores—then there is no excuse for our not engaging in total war on, under and over the land and sea—and doing it tomorrow. If that is true, our failure to fight is the most pusillanimous chapter in American history.

The British argument is correct from another angle. I

can't recall any English official urging that they are "fighting our war." A Chinese, Mr. Soong, said the other day that China is fighting our war, but no Briton, to my knowledge, has said it. It has been said plenty of times but always by American neck-stickers-out on our Eastern seaboard. These people are more pro-British than British. Their pronouncements haunt the radio ether waves. They punctuate the Eastern metropolitan press like the thrumming of a Sioux war-drum. They lose no opportunity to appear on the hustings not intoning as brave old Cato did, "My voice is still for war," but, well-knowing the eighty-five percent American opposition to war and also the unspoken deception of the phrase, they begin by saying, "My voice is still for 'methods short of war.'"

When a man insists on effective aid by "methods short of war" to a country which he claims is "fighting our war," he is convicted out of his own mouth of one of two great evils. Either he is urging on his fellow American a cowardly course of permitting mercenaries to defend our liberties where he is unwilling to risk his own life, or he is employing a subterfuge. He doesn't dare to disclose his own purpose, which is war. So he seeks, step by concealed step, to draw a great peaceful country which is opposed to war-involvement into a situation from which it cannot retreat without open war.

I couldn't feel comfortable under this philosophy. To me it seems either cowardice and national dishonor, a poltroon intent to sacrifice the blood and flesh of Englishmen to save the blood and flesh of Americans—or it is satanic guile, a kind of national entrapment, a failure frankly to disclose a purpose to force a war, when the people intend no war, but, nevertheless, to force war upon them by entangling their feet in a situation where no escape from war is pos-

sible. In this modern sloganeering day, when life is too complex for the average layman to think things through and the truth which he is allowed to hear is too fragmentary to permit him to form his own sound judgments, the constant repetition of a lie has become the most frequently used and successful weapon of the totalitarian propagandist. Both Hitler and Mussolini have openly discussed, approved and flagrantly used this method—which hasn't been hard for some of our most headlong interventionists to understand. "Britain is fighting our war" is the slogan that they repeat most frequently. For the reasons just stated it is as fateful as the drums of doom. For if they can repeat it often enough to make our people unthinkingly accept it—as they sometimes accept an advertising slogan—there goes your old ball game. We are in it in the full sense of Private Mulvaney's "bloody war and a sickly season—North, East, South and West."

Most of the movies are controlled by men avid for war and they reek with war propaganda. The principal radio systems are similarly controlled and it is as hard as for a camel to enter a needle's eye to get continuously on the air with anything but pro-British radio propaganda. All such "independent" and "impartial" radio reporters, commentators and editors as H. V. Kaltenborn, Raymond Gram Swing, Dorothy Thompson and Gabriel Heatter are constantly pumping into the great still pool of public opinion most reckless incitements to a pro-British war. Some of the most influential newspapers are in similar hands. To my knowledge they have strongly influenced Mr. Wendell Willkie's utterances. He has recently said that in spite of powerful pressures during the campaign he remained true to his interventionist views. What he told me during the campaign was that interventionist pressure had been so power-

ful that, in spite of his non-interventionist convictions, he had to be careful of his words.

All this is a clever use of a small community of influence by sincere Americans of the fifty per cent variety rather than a conspiracy, but that doesn't make it any less effective—or, as I believe, less dangerous. This leading by the nose of American public opinion to the opposite of its own convictions and interests is one of the most expert pieces of propaganda in all the records of publicity—and, from the American standpoint, one of the most evil. All this dangerous publicity strength has given some commentators of contrary opinion pause, and will continue to do so in increasing degree until we get the concentration camps working. It gives me no pause and will give me none until I am silenced by superior authority.

The crux of this whole situation—the question of whether we are to finance and engage bloodily in a new World War to the probable total bankruptcy and possible military and naval humiliation of the United States—is the truth or falsity of the slogan “Britain is fighting our war.”

The statement is frequently made that the Monroe Doctrine has depended on the presence of the British Navy in the Atlantic. It is true that the Monroe Doctrine suited British purposes when it was enunciated. It is equally true that, from the time it was published until now, it has been challenged four times. One was the seizure of the Falkland Islands by Great Britain. A second time was the advancement of British claims through obscure rights of timber-cutting to obtain what is now British Honduras. A third was British acquiescence or even assistance in the French occupation of Mexico when our backs were to the wall in the Civil War. The fourth was an outrageous British insistence on taking away from Venezuela part of the mouth

of the Orinoco River, which President Cleveland prevented only by outright threat of armed resistance.

It is quite clear why each of these attempts was made although the Monroe Doctrine had received such support from Britain. The Falkland Islands control the western hemisphere route around Cape Horn. British Honduras controls what we have for decades thought would be our alternative inter-ocean route through a new Nicaraguan Canal. Control of the Orinoco River is control of the water route to most of the interior of the northern half of South America. A hand in the occupation of Mexico coupled with Britain's own strategic island possessions in the Caribbean Sea would govern the eastern entrance to the proposed Panama routes between the oceans. The Mexican business also was part of a dark dream, as old as Aaron Burr, to split the United States on the Mason and Dixon Line and create a competing slave Confederacy south to Panama.

What was behind our own undeclared wars which invaded Mexico twice—once at Vera Cruz and once through Columbus, New Mexico, into Chihuahua—including the astonishing orders given Pershing not to capture Villa as he could have done any day? The answer probably never will be made clear. Neither will the stark abandonment of Woodrow Wilson's campaign promises for American preferences in Panama Canal tolls as no "mess of molasses to catch flies" nor the unexplained hold-up of these two American thrusts in Mexico. But there is no doubt that part of these mysteries were British intrusions into the military and naval area of the two Americas.

"Britannia rules the waves." She naturally rules them in her interest first and ours second. To say that is no slap at her. There is not, and there never has been, any altruism among nations. No government has ever conducted its

affairs in the interest of any people other than its own—except on certain occasions when Uncle Sap has done so—as he is being euchred into doing now. But Uncle would still do well to respect the words of his own father, George Washington, when he said good-by:

“It is folly for one nation to look for disinterested favors to another . . . it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character . . . by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater folly than to expect from, or calculate upon, real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.”

British interest in America, including the Monroe Doctrine, is obviously the same interest that has urged her to control every critical point on the ocean lanes of the whole round globe—Gibraltar, Malta, the Suez, Aden, Singapore, Hong Kong, Capetown, the Falkland Islands, positions controlling both the Panamanian and Nicaraguan routes across the American Isthmus, Halifax, the mouth of the St. Lawrence, and the British Isles themselves. It is the most complete network of key naval bases on the surface of the globe. We do not envy England her possessions. We are glad that she has them. We should understand her desire to keep them all. But to remark of her far-flung strategy to keep them all now, “England is fighting our war,” is just too much for prudent American consumption.

We are vitally interested in seeing that her keypoints in this hemisphere do not fall into hands more hostile to us than hers, but the idea that there is any such community of interest as would raise an obligation of honor in us to die for dear old Dong Dang in Asia, be slain for Singapore

or Suez, or fight to preserve her retention of most of Africa and a large part of Asia with their subject and miserable peoples, is plain baloney.

There is a disposition now to regard Washington's advice about the inherent selfishness of nations as obsolete. Yet we have suffered grievously by neglecting it. We intervened in the last World War and gave Britain and her allies all they asked of blood and of treasure by the billions. It is not too much to say that we turned overwhelming defeat for them into accomplished victory. For this we were accused of doing too little too late and were then reviled for seeking repayment of our loans. In this revilement Uncle Sap became Uncle Shylock and even Mr. Winston Churchill, according to the Chicago Federation of Labor's *Federation News*, said in 1936 to William Griffin, New York inquirer: "Legally we owe this (war debt) to the United States but logically we don't, and this because America should have minded her own business and stayed out of the World War. If she had done so the Allies would have made peace with Germany in the spring of 1917, thus saving over a million British, French, American and other lives and preventing the subsequent rise of Fascism and Naziism."

I don't hold this against Mr. Churchill. He is the greatest man of our generation and I am not sure that he is not one of the two or three greatest products of the Anglo-Saxon race in either Britain or America—the "either or" being used advisedly since his mother, we are proud to say, was an American. But Mr. Churchill is a realistic advocate for his own country—first, last and all the time. He should be. She has had none greater. But there should be some advocates for our own country, too. Mr. Churchill would be the first to credit an American who is such an advocate, as he would be the first, in his own heart, to

despise either the intelligence or the patriotism of one who isn't—and there must be many who aren't on his list.

On all these considerations, and many more, I have been unable to persuade myself that "Britain is fighting our war." Britain is fighting her own war. She made hideous errors in timing it and preparing for it but the fact remains that her principal fight is to retain her dominant Empire position with her own kinsmen and also over black, brown and yellow, conquered and subject peoples in three continents.

This is not to argue that they probably would not be better off in her hands than in those of nations which would like to replace her. But that is not our business and to expand the proposition into a declaration that, in this case, "Britain is fighting our war" is nothing less than absurd. Where our interests run parallel with those of Britain—as they do in the preservation of the British fleet in the Atlantic and the exclusion of other powers from it—it is the part of hardheaded common sense to assist her within limits already discussed, but only on a realistic rejection of any "Britain is fighting our war" slogan. In the first place it is not true, and in the second place you can't utter such mendacious nonsense and preserve your self-respect if you do not favor an alliance with her and declaration of all-out war against Germany tomorrow.

An equally insupportable dogma runs something like this: "England supported the Monroe Doctrine from its inception and the only thing that has preserved it since has been the presence of the British fleet in the Atlantic." England acceded to the Monroe Doctrine because the Holy Alliance which took over the ruins of Napoleon's Empire was threatening to restore to the European monarchy of Spain all her revolted colonies in the Americas—from Mexico (which then included California and a good fifth of what

is now the United States) south to Cape Horn. Through the centuries when Spain had those colonies she was England's principal and most dangerous enemy. Of course England didn't want to see them reconquered. But was that for love of the United States?

Another absurdity about this dictum that we owe the Monroe Doctrine to British beneficence is that, as earlier related, the Monroe Doctrine has been challenged only four times and, in at least three, England was the direct challenger—in the Falkland Islands, in Honduras and in Venezuela. The fourth time was in the joint occupation of Mexican ports during our Civil War which resulted in the attempt by the French to establish a Mexican Empire under Maximilian. In this England was an original party. Passing this up entirely, the assertion that only the British fleet has protected the Monroe Doctrine during all these years could be sufficiently answered by the query, "Against whom?" Not only in the Revolution but in the War of 1812, the American Navy gave a sufficient account of itself and, from the latter date to this good day, what sea power, except perhaps England, could have successfully challenged us on these coasts? Not any. Only one tried, the Spanish Navy off Santiago, and not a single ship escaped. There simply is no truth in this assertion, and why Americans should make it against the interests of America is a little difficult to understand. We have protected the Monroe Doctrine by reliance upon our own strength alone, and the principal if not the only challenger was Great Britain.

Much weight has been given recently to the "friendliness" of the British squadron in Manila Bay when Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet there. There was not enough German naval strength there to have affected the outcome of the Battle of Manila Bay. The small British fleet was

“friendly” but no “incident” occurred. Of course the British didn’t want to see Germany seize this strong point on the Asiatic littoral. But as George Washington warned and as is always the case, there is no altruism among nations. The incident is insignificant and has, on the dread subject we are discussing, no contribution of value whatever.

Some of the most absurd statements have been made by Anglophiles, as, for example, that in 1790 the British lease-loaned us guns from Halifax for the defense of Charleston against the French! In 1790 the French Revolution was at its height, Britain had not yet released all American Territory won in the Revolution, and was practically at war with France.

When our interests have paralleled those of the British we have supported them—and they us. When the contrary has been the case, the contrary has been the course of action. We fought two wars with them and perhaps the only reason we didn’t fight a third, when they harassed us in every way possible during our Civil War and the ruling British class was avid to see our nation torn asunder, was that Abraham Lincoln said that “one war at a time was enough” for his administration.

In that war they supplied the enemies of the Union, helped by outfitting and furnishing crews for Confederate vessels to drive our commerce off the seas, and encouraged every possible embarrassment to our embattled government.

It isn’t pleasant to write in this way about a nation, a government and a cause with which we all have sympathy. Indeed it is so unpleasant that it would be impossible if it were not for the fact that very influential people, who are getting away with it, and seem to be able to see every point of view except the American, rest their whole case on

two false slogans: "Britain is fighting our war" and "Only the British fleet has protected us and the Monroe Doctrine for more than a hundred and twenty years."

It simply isn't true and if I thought it were true I would be rampant for war tomorrow. Britain is fighting her own war. It is a war in part for continued imperial dominion over weaker and exploited, subdued and subject peoples. To the extent that her interest parallels ours, I say, "Support her." To the extent that support of her butters our insufficient strength too thin over too wide an area and builds not our defense in our two bordering oceans but dissipates it far abroad, let us say, "America first, last and all the time."

Robert E. Wood

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY TODAY

THOSE of us who are opposed to our entry into this European war are unequivocally for a strong defense. In fact, the American people stand united on the subject of defense. In a world of force we are trying to build this strong defense as rapidly as possible. Because of the importance of the defense program, most patriotic citizens are willing to forego their differences on domestic policies, even when they see serious points of criticism. Unless we strip our own production by sending *all* our fighting planes and *all* our munitions to England, we should, with the advantages of our geographical position, be able, within a reasonable time, to present an impregnable front to an invader.

But such unity stops on the subject of our foreign policy. On our foreign policy, as now determined, may depend the future fate of our country—the happiness and prosperity of its citizens, the survival of our system of free enterprise and of our political democracy.

Let us briefly review the history of our foreign policy since September, 1939. The Neutrality Act was originally passed to prevent our involvement in European wars. It was reaffirmed by the President at the beginning of this conflict. Soon that Act was amended so that munitions of war could be shipped to one of the belligerents on a cash-and-carry basis. From the beginning of the war, most of the Administration officials, the Treasury Department and

the State Department were never really neutral. A new Secretary of the Navy and a new Secretary of War were appointed in 1940, on the pretext of forming a bi-partisan cabinet. Actually they were appointed because both were strong interventionists. Both have since advocated our entry into the war. A propaganda committee, headed originally by Mr. William Allen White and receiving unofficial direction from official Washington, was formed to influence our citizens to aid the Allies with everything short-of-war. The "short-of-war" phrase was a cloak to mask the real intentions of the backers of the committee. That committee is now advocating our actual entry into the war.

In 1940 occurred a national election. The platforms of both parties, in response to the desires of the people, contained statements opposing our entrance into the European war—both candidates in their pre-election speeches formally promised the people that they would keep the country out of the war, that they would never send our Army, Navy or Air Force to Europe, Asia or Africa.

Once the election was past, the Lease-Lend Bill was introduced in Congress and finally passed, but passed, so most of its *supporters* represented, as a peace bill, not as a war bill. The Lease-Lend Bill could more properly be called a Gift Bill, for the seven billions already voted, with the additional billions to be voted, will never be repaid in money or in kind. When our citizens pay their income taxes, excise taxes and other forms of taxes in 1942, they will begin to realize that probably one-third of these taxes are being paid for British defense—for planes, munitions, food and other supplies which have been sent to Britain. The Secretary of the Treasury made the direct or implied promise that British resources in the United States would be liquidated and used in part payment for munitions and

goods already contracted for. These resources are not being liquidated, and a loan is now being negotiated with the RFC so that British citizens can retain their American holdings indefinitely.

The President, after promising all-out aid to Britain, in a later speech this year committed the United States to crushing Hitler and Germany. There is a vast difference between aiding England and the English people to survive and underwriting the continuance of the present British Empire and a complete victory over Hitler and Germany. England alone, with all the supplies we can send her, should be able to defend her island, but alone she cannot win a victory over Germany, and her responsible leaders admit it. The British General Wavell has just stated that England must have airplanes, tanks, munitions, transport and finally *men*. If the war continues long enough, American man power will be needed to win the conflict.

Unless Russia can defeat Germany or can involve her in a long drawn-out affair like the Japanese-Chinese war, there is only one possible way that Germany can be crushed, and that is for the United States to enter the war with all her resources and expand those resources to the limit—men, money and munitions. That course will probably mean years of war and then the outcome will be uncertain, for we will have the disadvantage of fighting the war in Europe or Africa, 3,000 miles from our base, a disadvantage that will outweigh the advantages of our immense natural resources. The end of such a war will leave us with a debt of at least two hundred billions and eventual repudiation.

We have lectured and bullied France, our one-time ally, our friend since the days of the Revolution. We have refused to send food to her people and, by freezing her funds, have refused to let her pay for this much needed food. We have

apparently done our best to throw France into the arms of Germany.

We have refused to send food to the starving Belgians, the Dutch and the Norwegians—and a few of our eminent churchmen have endorsed this unchristian course of action.

We have adopted a highhanded course of action with the Japanese and tried to dictate their course in Asia, with the result that in case of our involvement in the war in Europe we have a potential powerful enemy at our rear in the Pacific.

To cap the climax, we have recently frozen the funds of Finland, whose heroic resistance we were applauding a little over a year ago. Finland is the one European country which has discharged its obligations toward us since the last World War.

Our foreign policy has been such that we have succeeded in making potential enemies of every nation in Europe except Great Britain, and an enemy of the most powerful nation in Asia—Japan. If we do not enter the war, there will be great bitterness toward us in Great Britain. In short, our foreign policy may leave us entirely isolated after the war.

This policy is apparently based on the following premises:

- (1) Germany is determined, not merely to create a new order in Europe but to conquer the world.
- (3) Our destiny is entirely linked up with that of the British Empire—we have no independent destiny of our own.
- (3) The British Navy is our main bulwark; if Britain is defeated, we will be invaded by Germany, Japan or a combination of the two and will be unable to defend ourselves.

- (4) In the event of a British defeat, Germany can strangle the United States economically.

Based on these premises, we are pouring out billions to Britain for the defense, not alone of England but of the British Empire; we are sending her almost our entire output of fighting planes and bombers, vast quantities of munitions and other supplies; we are stripping our ocean and coastwise carrying trade of ships; we are going to tax ourselves to the bone, not alone for our defense but for hers. The Lease-Lend Bill is the law of the land. I accept it as such. Material aid to Britain is the desire of the majority of the people. But certain questions do arise: Should we place any limits to this aid? Is there not a point where it would be better to add to our own equipment in fighting planes than to send it all to Britain? Should we exact anything in return for this aid?

I believe all the premises on which this foreign policy is based are false.

I can find in "Mein Kampf" a program for German expansion in Europe but not one for conquering the world or the Western Hemisphere. I do not believe in Hitler's promises or words but I do believe that his program will be based on what he believes to be the interests of Germany. It is plainly to those interests to expand and to consolidate the expansion in Europe, to displace England as the banker, broker and middleman of Europe. It is plainly not to those interests, after a war waged all over the continent of Europe, involving the greatest material preparation ever made by a nation, to embark at its close on a course of conquest over the oceans, a project vastly more difficult than anything he has yet undertaken. There has been a confusion of thought in this country in failing to distinguish between the

ease of conquest of a great land army operating in continental areas and the very great difficulties of conquest for a great military machine operating over great ocean spaces against another continent or hemisphere. After all, the German military machine has not yet been able to overcome the English Channel. American and foreign intellectuals who write so glibly on the perils of attack on us from across the oceans overlook such practical consideration as the immense difficulties of supply and transport.

A new doctrine has been spread abroad in this country—that we are dependent on Great Britain and the British Empire. This is not the belief held by Americans for over a century. We have been an independent people and we can continue to be one. We kept aloof from Europe's wars until 1917, and that adventure should have taught us wisdom. We fought to "make the world safe for democracy." What a travesty it has proved to be.

The doctrine that the British Navy is our protection is also new to us. The British Navy, by outfitting the Confederate privateers, swept our merchant marine from the seas during the Civil War. We have our own Navy, probably the largest and most powerful navy in the world today.

The bogey of military invasion of the United States, whether by land or air, has been pretty well punctured. The most searching and competent analysis of Hemisphere Defense has been given by Hanson Baldwin, Military and Naval Expert of the New York *Times*. He says:

"What is needed to make Hemisphere Defense a workable military policy? If we take the right measures this hemisphere can be defended and we need fear no evil from any hostile coalition of great powers. We need:

- (1) Sea power—the present program is ample.
- (2) Air power—long range bombers particularly.

- (3) Land power—a mobile, finely trained *small* army of 500,000 to 700,000 men.
- (4) Bases—we have or have planned all that we need except a large air and naval base on the shoulder of Brazil.”

These are wise words, full of common sense, and when we are able to reason calmly we will probably adopt such a policy.

We are told that from an economic standpoint we cannot survive if Europe and Asia are dominated by Germany and Japan. The specter of slave or forced labor is held up to us—cartels, barter and clearing arrangements. Slave labor or cheap labor is always expensive labor in the end. We have had to compete with that before, and successfully. Barter is clumsy and in the long run will disappear. We held our own in trade in South America in the period 1935-1938, when the Nazis were making great efforts there; we can do the same again. Graeme Howard, a practical authority in the field of foreign trade, and Bernard Baruch have both, from their wide experience, stated that the United States can survive in the economic sense. With our wealth of raw materials, our unrivalled plant facilities, our experience in mass production, our intelligent labor and our skillful management, we should and can compete. Above all, if we can buy from South America, we can sell to them.

In this matter of foreign policy we see two philosophies in conflict. One might be termed Americanism, the other Alienism. Americanism follows the precepts laid down in Washington's Farewell Address and by other founders of the Republic; it bids us take advantage of our unique geographical position and keep aloof from Europe's wars. Alienism tells us that our existence and destiny are bound up with Europe and Asia, that we must enter their wars and permanently take our stand in European power politics.

Where does the main support of this latter philosophy spring from? It originates largely in New York City, a city with the largest foreign-born population in the United States, a city filled today with refugees from Europe, a city where the wealthy and upper class native American element is so dominated by financial and social ties with Great Britain that it has become a class of colonials, not Americans—the class that is preaching permanent union with Britain. The same is true of this element in other eastern seaboard cities.

As an American, I can respect all Americans who disagree with our views except members of this limited class of so-called colonials. But as an American I resent the procession of refugee royalty, who fled their native countries and are living in Canada and in England and in the United States in comfort instead of sharing the sufferings of their peoples. Queen Wilhelmina of Holland, the wealthiest woman in Europe, issued a proclamation calling on her Army to fight to the death and then took a ship for Britain. I resent Lord Woolton, the British Food Minister, telling Americans to have meatless or cheeseless days and advising us on our diet. I resent Sir Victor Sassoon, of the wealthy British family that made its fortune in the opium trade, coming to our West Coast and telling us what our foreign policy should be with Japan. I resent books like *Now Is The Time* written by Pierre Van Paassen, a Hollander who has spent most of his life in Holland, Canada and other foreign countries, a writer and a correspondent, telling us what our correct military strategy should be and what our foreign policy should be. Speaking as a native American citizen, I am tired of the flood of advice pressed upon us by the writers, speakers and intellectuals of other countries, most of whom have been here but a very short time and none of whom have

roots in this country. I feel uneasy at the influence of Great Britain, of Harold Laski and John Maynard Keynes, on our State Department and portions of our entire Administration. An Englishman is always for England first. I admire them for that quality but I do not want to see their interests put above our own.

Over 50 per cent of our people are of English descent. We have the same language, literature and ideals of government. But while we may like and admire the English people and have a profound sympathy for them in their present condition, the future well-being and best interests of our own 130,000,000 people must always be paramount in our thinking and must guide us in our decisions.

Someday it is going to dawn on the peoples of Canada and South Africa as well as ourselves that we cannot afford to organize rescue expeditions for England every quarter of a century.

The differences of opinion as to our foreign policy are now beginning to narrow down to a few very vital questions:

What is included in hemisphere defense. If we have to fight Hitler, we can best fight to advantage on a line drawn along our newly acquired bases from Greenland down to Trinidad and possibly down to a base in Brazil. If these bases were attacked, or hostile warships entered these waters, the nation would go to war united. But if hemisphere defense involves the seizing of the Azores, the Cape Verde Islands, Dakar or Iceland, as has just been announced, there is room for an honest difference of opinion, and there probably would be no such unity, for seizure of these points can be considered as another step to edge us into the war and not a step for defense.

What does freedom of the seas mean? We yielded it voluntarily to England during the other World War. If it means

keeping submarines out of our territorial waters and if it means free passage of American ships to neutral ports outside of the war zone, the nation would be united. But if it means sending American ships, with contraband of war, to the war zones in violation of the Neutrality Act, there would be no such unity. If freedom of the seas means a pretext for our Secretary of the Navy to involve us in the war, it can have no united support from the people. If it means convoys and the use of the Navy, there will be no such unity.

The America First Committee supports the President in his defense measures, in his efforts to unite North and South America in what may be termed hemisphere defense. But it does not support intervention in Europe. It does not believe that it is to the best interests of the United States to expend our blood and treasure in an European war. It does not believe that we will be helpless in the event of a Hitler victory in Europe, undesirable as that would be.

We know from the speeches of some of our Cabinet Officers that they want active intervention, actual entry into the war. Their speeches must have been approved by the President. Yet we cannot tell from the speeches of the President just what his intentions are, and just as the American people are in doubt, so are the English people. Just as we want to know whether we are going into this war, so the English people want even more acutely to know. One of the London papers in commenting on the President's Fourth of July speech said, "We want deeds; the time for words has passed." I agree with our interventionist opponents that a decision must be made and made in the near future. Either we should decide to go into the war as an active ally of England or we should decide to stay out. If we decide to stay out, we should advise England to make a

negotiated peace. I agree with Senator Connolly of Texas when he stated that this is not our war, that if England can retain her independence, her fleet and most of her colonies she should make peace. Whether such a peace is practicable I do not know, but we should ascertain whether it is possible within the next few months.

But a decision as far reaching as must be the decision to enter war involving the lives and future of our nation should not be made by one man, be that man ever so gifted and even if that man is the President of the United States. The decision must be made by Congress. For if we are to get into an undeclared war as the result of executive or administrative action, there would be apathy and sullenness, not unity, in this nation. The experience of France shows that in a democracy, unless 90 per cent of the people are convinced of the necessity of war, the war cannot be waged successfully.

I believe this country has a great destiny before it on this hemisphere, that with a policy of cooperative regionalism in North and South America we can develop the finest civilization in the world. I believe that our entry into the European war would be foolish and that it would arrest our progress for a long period of time and leave unsolved all the great domestic problems we now have before us.

I believe with Colonel Lindbergh that we must change our policies and our leadership. And when I say that, I mean in a strictly constitutional way. We have a Congressional election in 1942. Regardless of party, every interventionist in the House and every interventionist senator who comes up for re-election should be defeated. Although our President remains in office until 1944, if the will of the people in this matter of an European war is expressed

strongly enough in the election of 1942, he may see fit to remove some of the leading war-mongers in his cabinet.

One difficulty with the present situation is that both sides—interventionists and isolationists—believe that the majority of the people support their side of the argument. The people themselves have had no chance to vote on the question. The only guide to sentiment is the Gallup Poll. Dr. Gallup is an interventionist but I do not question his integrity or sincerity of purpose. His poll, based on the sampling method, showed surprisingly accurate results in the national election. But I question the accuracy of a poll with involved questions applied to only 1,200 people out of our 130,000,000.

The situation is so unusual that it calls for unusual measures. By law, the President is charged with the formulation of our foreign policy, and certainly in ordinary times there should be no interference with the exercise of his prerogative. Only Congress can declare war. But at this particular time, I should think that both Congress and the President would welcome a national advisory referendum. Such a referendum could contain three questions:

1. Shall the United States enter the European war to aid Britain and to defeat Hitler?
2. Shall the United States declare war if any portion of the Western Hemisphere be attacked?
3. Shall the Neutrality Act be repealed?

The Russian campaign is, at least temporarily, taking the pressure off Britain. There would be no better time to take this referendum.

If Congress were to pass a law enacting a national advisory referendum, the results, while not legally binding

on either the President or Congress, would have the force of a moral mandate. And I see in such a referendum a measure for achieving the unity we all desire. The present controversy has lasted long enough. If the majority of the people of this country feel that we should enter this European war, then the President and Congress should take us into the war and all of us as good Americans should abide by the results and should do our utmost to support our country in the war. But if the people should vote to stay out, the foreign policy of the Administration and Congress should be shaped accordingly, our defense continued, aid to Britain continued within the limits of the Neutrality Act and the Lease-Lend Bill with no convoys—and all Americans should uphold that policy and abide by it. Only by such a referendum can we stop controversy and achieve unity.

Amos R. E. Pinchot

April 29, 1941

The Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

Because Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh has made a frank, clear statement of what he believes to be Britain's chances in her war with Germany, you saw fit, at your press conference on Friday, April 25th, to describe Colonel Lindbergh as a defeatist and a modern "Vallandigham." Vallandigham, as most people know, was a Representative from Ohio who was accused of treasonable utterances during the Civil War, convicted by a military court, and banished in 1863.

May I remind you, Mr. President, that, some time ago, you told your friend, Senator Sheridan Downey of California, that Hitler's power was so great that, in all probability, Germany would win the war. On June 13th, 1940, after expressing regret that your administration had not heeded Colonel Lindbergh's advice to build a great fleet of military airplanes, Mr. Downey addressed the Senate, as follows:

"I might say that the President of the United States stated to me—and it is no violation of ethics when I say it, because he proclaimed it in the press—that the

military power of Germany was so great that the overwhelming odds were in favor of Germany winning this war."

If making a low appraisal of Britain's chances of victory makes one a defeatist and a Vollandigham, who was the defeatist then, who the Vollandigham? May I also remind you that members of your Cabinet and other White House spokesmen have repeatedly stated that this country would go down to defeat and its people to slavery in a war with the Axis Powers unless we are protected by the British Navy. Certainly Colonel Lindbergh has never said anything like that. On the contrary, he has consistently held that, if we would prepare ourselves properly, it would be as impossible for Hitler to invade America as for America to invade Germany or the rest of the European continent.

Speaking of defeatism, on Thursday, April 24th, at the Publishers' Dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria, your Secretary of the Navy, The Honorable Frank Knox, made a speech, a remarkable speech, which you endorsed the next day. In that speech the Secretary said that if we do not convoy war materials to England, so that the English may continue to protect us, the United States will assuredly be doomed. His exact words were as follows:

"We have declared that the aggressor nations must not be permitted to win. We have irrevocably committed ourselves to see that that is prevented. We have put all of our resources into the scales to bring defeat to those who would rule the world by force. We have acknowledged that our destiny, just as much as the destiny of the British Empire and the ultimate destiny of the conquered peoples of the Low Countries, of Scandinavia,

of France and of the Balkans, are at stake. Having gone thus far, we can only go on.

"Hitler cannot allow our war supplies and food to reach England—he will be defeated if they do. We cannot allow our goods to be sunk in the Atlantic—we shall be beaten if they are."

Did you ever hear Colonel Lindbergh or General Robert E. Wood, or any member of the America First Committee say anything as defeatist and old-womanish as that? Secretary Knox says we are sunk unless England holds our noses above water. That is a fine announcement for the head of the Navy to make to the world, and especially to the officers and enlisted men in the Service. And it is a fine thing for the President of the United States, who is Commander-in-Chief of both the Army and the Navy, to endorse.

May I add that this dinner, at which the guest of honor, Secretary Knox, virtually declared war on one foreign nation, while he proclaimed our dependence on another, was also unusual in that it began by rising and singing—not the Star Spangled Banner, but God save the King. And it may be said that your press conference next day was likewise unusual. For I believe it was the first time in American history that an American President has laid down the proposition that it is reprehensible, if not treasonable, for an American citizen to question another country's ability to defend itself, but praise-worthy to deny the ability of the United States.

Mr. President, at this juncture, when your administration is resorting to one device after another, patrols, convoying and propagation of fear, to take this country into war—a war which you swore to avoid; a war which the people do

not want and do not propose to have; a war for which our military establishment is sadly inadequate; a war from which the people of America can gain nothing but sorrow and disaster—it would seem that a little old-fashioned courage, common sense and self-reliance might be in order.

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT

May 8, 1941

The Hon. Henry L. Stimson,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Harry:

You and I have been friends for many years. And, though our ways have parted since the old days, I have always thought of you as an able, honorable and patriotic man. Yet, as I listened to the measured sentences of your broadcast Tuesday night, I confess that I was shocked and deeply distressed. And I will tell you some of the reasons why.

Your broadcast began with a complaint against those who say you are trying to get America into war, who say you are "a warmonger." Then you proceeded to call for convoying, which the President says will necessarily mean war. And you ended up with an exhortation to the youth of America to be ready to die in a war with Germany, which you virtually declared to be an accomplished fact—though Congress has never declared war.

You did not hesitate to base your plea for convoying on the incorrect allegation that American supplies cannot be delivered in sufficient quantity to Britain on account of the German U-boat blockade. On Wednesday, the day after your broadcast, Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, reported that, out of the hundreds of vessels

that have been cleared from American ports, only eight have been sunk since the beginning of the year.

Harry, was that information available to you before your broadcast? If it was, you owe an explanation and, I think, an apology to every citizen of this country.

Why didn't you ask for convoying and war last summer, when Britain, as now, was calling on us for more planes and munitions, and when, according to your testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee, she was in such a desperate condition that her collapse and the seizure of her navy by Germany was possible at any moment?

On July 31st, you appeared before that Committee and, after stating that we could no longer rely on our Navy and the Atlantic and Pacific oceans for defense, you said:

"You, Gentlemen, are the trustees of the security of the United States."

"A prudent trustee must take into consideration the possibility that in another thirty days Great Britain herself may be conquered and her shipyards pass under German control."

A few days later, Secretary of the Navy Knox made a similar statement before the same Committee, though he extended the period of possible collapse from thirty to sixty days.

Nevertheless, in the entire period between these prognostications and November 5th, when the people went to the polls and re-elected Mr. Roosevelt on his clear, categorical and unconditional pledges of peace, neither you, nor the President, nor any man in the Administration said a mumbling word in favor of convoys, or any act by our government that might involve us in war. And invariably

all proposals to help Britain were coupled with the promise that, whatever happened, you people in Washington would do nothing that might result in war.

On October 30th, at Boston, President Roosevelt told twenty-two thousand cheering men and women:

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

On many platforms he pledged no "intervention in foreign disputes," no "Army, Naval or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas except in case of attack."

Now, since on Tuesday night, as Secretary of War, you said the things the President has not dared to say for himself, I ask you this question: What are the hidden forces, who are the people with a vested interest in war, what are the mysterious, unspoken considerations that, after the ballots were counted, so suddenly switched Mr. Roosevelt from the path of peace to the highroad of war?

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT

July 11, 1941.

The Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Roosevelt:

Nine scant months ago, by the election of a Chief Executive for a third consecutive term, a dictatorship was begotten on the body politic of this country. Your occupa-

tion of Iceland, without knowledge or consent of Congress, together with your July 7th message and July 8th press conference, disclosing your intention to wage an undeclared war on German sea power in the Atlantic, gives proof that the period of gestation is over, and a new dictatorship born to the world.

Mr. President, if you act upon your proposition to shoot it out with the German Navy, should it attack vessels carrying contraband to England, or even show itself in the waters between Iceland and the United States, you will do this in clear defiance of international law and our Constitution, that places the war-making power in Congress. Moreover, this act of war will be a repudiation of your pre-election contract with the people, to keep America out of war provided they would give you a third term in office. And it may be said that, for the performance of this contract, you were paid in advance on November 5th, 1940, by the votes of twenty-seven million then trusting, but now betrayed, citizens.

Mr. President, some of us have short memories nowadays. Consequently, with your permission, I will remind you of the evening of October 23rd, 1940, when in Convention Hall, in Philadelphia, you addressed some sixteen thousand wildly cheering citizens as follows:

"To Republicans and Democrats, to every man, woman and child in the nation I say this—your President and your Secretary of State are following the road to peace. We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war.

"We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our

Army, Naval or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.’”

And these citizens certainly believed that, by the word “attack,” you meant attack, and not some seizure by Germany of some other nation’s bases in Africa, or the Indian Ocean on the far side of this planet. In Madison Square Garden, on October 28th, you said:

“We shall continue to go forward in firm faith. We shall continue to go forward in peace.”

And two days later, at Boston, you rammed home your New York and Philadelphia pledges in the following now familiar words:

“And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.”

Mr. President, Iceland is not in the Americas, or even in the Western Hemisphere, as you have erroneously claimed. It is as much a foreign country as England or France. It is in the war zone, three thousand miles from the United States and but seven hundred from the English coast. Nevertheless, you told your press conference that you propose to relieve its British garrison with American “boys.”

More than that, you said you would “act” in other undisclosed places outside this Hemisphere, without authority of Congress, whenever, in your opinion, such action might be necessary. In a word, you propose to act, not as an American president, but as a confessed dictator equally scornful of his own promises and of the public will. And in

a hilarious mood you wound up that strange conference, where the floor was littered with your torn up pledges, with jocular remarks on the fallibility of geographers, and a comic story about an old woman in a boat.

Mr. President, I earnestly beg you to reconsider the course you propose. For, if you continue on that course, that is to say use Iceland and ports in far away parts of the globe as bases from which to launch attacks against Germany, in your personal, unauthorized war, you will not merely kick down the ladder on which you climbed to the highest, if most perilous, honor ever given an American—three terms in the White House—but break the downright agreement you made with Congress, before the Lend-Lease Bill was passed: namely, that our government would not be responsible for delivering goods lent, leased, sold or given to Britain, and that the provisions of the bill should in no case be used to provoke war.

Today there is no "defense" reason in God's world for entering a declared or undeclared war that did not exist in greater measure when you made your peace pledges last fall at Philadelphia, Hartford, Boston, New York, Brooklyn, Cleveland and Washington. We are far better prepared for defense than then, and so is England. And, with our rising production, we can admittedly make America impregnable, before Hitler, involved as he is, could organize an expeditionary force, if he were mad enough to do so. No military authority has dared testify otherwise.

That is one reason why the majority of Americans are little moved by the cowardly doctrine that we cannot defend ourselves and will be enslaved by Hitler unless we go forth and fight him in Africa and Asia, or in Europe on his home grounds. That doctrine does not make sense. And everybody knows it. The one place where the English have

stopped Hitler is England. And yet, from the moment of your re-election, you have not ceased to use every expedient to spread a psychology of hysteria and blind funk in the United States. And you have invited German attack and total war by aggressive, provocative acts that follow each other in ever faster succession.

The unvarnished truth is that you are taking part in something which can only be described as an international conspiracy to draw America into participation in bloody, foreign wars that are needless for defense and prejudicial to every legitimate interest of our people. Meantime you and your spokesmen, in and out of Congress, are reviling every loyal American who says now precisely what you said nine months ago, and whose cardinal sin is that he loves his own country better than any other.

So this, Mr. President, is democracy—your democracy, democracy *à la mode* and *à la New Deal*. It is the first fruit of your four freedoms—especially including freedom of speech and freedom from fear and war—which you propose to install and defend in every part of the world. A people that does not want war dragged into war by the irresponsible will of an individual who rose to power by promising to keep them out of war! Mr. President, once more I urge you, in the name of your country's good, and the reputation of American democratic government, to reconsider your course before it is too late.

Personally, I do not believe you can either force, frighten, or finesse a great self-respecting people into foreign wars which their common sense and considered judgment tell them to avoid. Nevertheless, if you do not abandon the purposes you announced in your message to Congress of July 7th, and your subsequent press conferences, you will do your country an unforgettable injury by serving notice

on the world that the integrity of America's White House is no longer intact.

In closing, may I remind you that not long ago you stated that the world can neither deal nor make peace with a man who does not keep his word.

Sincerely yours,

AMOS PINCHOT

Frances Gunther

FOR A FREE ENGLAND

MEN and Women of England: You have called into being a Free France Movement. You have called into being movements for a Free Belgium, a Free Holland, a Free Denmark, a Free Norway, a Free Poland, a Free Greece, a Free Jugoslavia.

Have you ever thought of evoking among yourselves a movement for a Free England?

Not to free yourselves from your external enemies—you have always kept your freedom for that—but to free yourselves from the strangling clutch of your own empire and the suicidal delusions of your own imperial grandeur?

You have been proud, in your understating way, of possessing the world's biggest empire—but has it ever occurred to you that you no longer possess your empire, but that it possesses you?

Has it ever occurred to you that you are not really having a good time, and that you are not really living a good life—even though you have worked so hard to grab and hold on to a quarter of the earth's surface?

Have you ever really realized that although you were the world's richest empire, your own people were the least cherished, and their homes the dreariest in all Europe?

Have you ever thought that Elizabethan England, which possessed not a stitch of land beyond its own salt water girdle, produced Shakespeare, and that Georgian England

with its Vast Empire Beyond the Seas, has produced only Noel Coward?

When you so resolutely sing *Rule Britannia* in your unmusical voices—you sang lovely songs in the days of Elizabeth but you gave all that up when you began possessing places—when you sing “Rule Britannia, rule the waves, Britons never will be slaves,” don’t you realize that you are slaves, that you are slaves of the waves you rule? And that since you rule all the waves, or try to, and since the waves cover the larger part of the world’s surface, this makes you the most enslaved of the world’s great peoples?

Armada was a glorious victory because you were defending your own shores, but have you ever stopped to think where you have gone from there? The little wooden wall of ships that defended this England so gallantly is now a gigantic steel vise that holds the earth in its grip. The lorelei of sea power has lured you clear ’round the world to Singapore, which is a long, long way from the white cliffs of Dover.

On your way ’round, your ships’ guns took Gibraltar from the Spanish people, and Malta from the Maltese, Egypt and the Suez from the Egyptian people, Aden from the Arab people, and all of the power of India from the people of India; you took Singapore and the Malayas from the Malayan people, and the cohesion of China from the Chinese people.

Every time you took a place, you had to take another place to “defend” the first place, and then a third place to “defend” the second. And every time you extended your line, you had to enlarge your fleet. And every time you enlarged your fleet, you had to take another base, another coaling station, and another trading port. . . And when ships became oil-driven, you had to take bases with oil,

and you had to take the oil-lands from the people they belonged to, and so you had to enlarge your fleet, and so you had to extend your line. . .

In order to do all this taking and all this extending, you had to do a great deal of warring, but whether you were warring for another trading port, or another coaling station, or another base, or another oil-pipe-line, you always *said* you were warring for the freedom and democracy of the world. . .

You always got your additional ports and stations and bases and pipe-lines, and sometimes a little spot of democracy did dribble out eventually here and there, and in the old, slow days before the radio and before the airplane, it all seemed all right enough.

But now it is the days after the radio and after the airplane, and there is very rapid communication and transportation, and times have changed, and people have changed, and sometimes we wonder whether you know that things and times and peoples have changed. We wonder because you still go on using the same old words in the same old way—because your government still goes on making speeches like the speeches of Pitt and Canning and Castlereagh and Palmerston—and still carries on the foreign policies of the 18th and 19th centuries, although we are nearly half way through the bloody twentieth century. Sometimes we wonder whether you realize that this is now the twentieth century?

We wonder, because although we hear much of the rebirth of democracy in Britain, and of how democratically the duchesses spend the nights in the air-raid shelters with their butlers and the dukes with the chambermaids, we do not hear anything about the birth of democracy in your foreign policy. We have not yet heard of the birth of democracy

for India. We have not yet heard of your righting the wrongs you have done to the peoples of Spain, Egypt, Arabia, Africa, and Asia, whose possessions you have taken by aggressive navalism.

We wonder whether you realize that the basic principles of the foreign policy of your governments from Pitt to Churchill have been and apparently still are these:

1. The possession of India.
2. The domination of all the seas of the earth.
3. The prevention of the unification of the states of continental Europe.

We wonder whether you realize that for generations you have been killing a great many people and dying to some extent yourselves and persuading many other nations to slaughter each other quite futilely in order to carry out these policies?

Perhaps you do not, because your governments have always translated these policies into a special verbiage for popular consumption. The policy of the possession of India becomes that mystic battle-cry and tribal call to the English holy wars: "*For the Life Line of Empire!*" The domination of all the seas undergoes a sea change and emerges as "The Freedom of the Seas," or more picturesquely as "The White Cliffs of Dover." To prevent the unification of Europe, it is announced that Britain is fighting for the "Restoration of the Independence of the Small Nations of Europe." We often wonder, when your governments go on and on and on using this same old verbiage, whether you still believe them, or think that anybody believes them? We hope you don't, because nobody else does.

When you speak, as you so incessantly do, of your Life Line of Empire, do you really think it is a life line, and if

so, what can you really think of Life? Or do you really know what you mean by the Life Line? Your government does, but do you? Do you fondly imagine that you are defending England, or even Canada, or South Africa, or Australia, when you defend the Life Line of Empire? Or do you know that in defending the Life Line of Empire, you are defending, *not* England, *not* even the Commonwealth, but your Imperial Possession Beyond the Seas, primarily India?

Do you realize that the maintenance of your Possession of India, and not the defence of England, has been for centuries, and still is, the central pivotal point of your government's foreign policy and naval policy? Do you realize that your government's fear of losing its Possession of India has been the basic cause of every war it has waged?

For when your government speaks, as it still so mellifluously does, of defending the Life Line of Empire, it means that in order to hold its possession of India, it must control and hold, at whatever cost, all the strategic approaches to India. These approaches to India have become more numerous and more technically difficult to hold with the passage of time and with the development of means of communication and transportation, methods of war-fare, and the national evolution of peoples. Your government means that in order to hold on to its possession of India, it must conquer and hold, at whatever cost, Gibraltar, Malta, Suez, Aden and Singapore. These are just five tiny red spots on the map, but in order to hold them, your government must effectually control and dominate three continents, Europe, Africa, and Asia, and seven seas, the Atlantic Ocean, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, the South China Sea, and the Pacific Ocean.

It is quite a job to dominate three continents and seven

seas, even for English men of power, who rather fancy themselves as natural dominators, and it has kept you busy for some three centuries, waging wars and winning wars, killing and dying, and persuading lots of other people to wage and win wars and to kill and die for you. It has kept you so busy that perhaps it is no wonder that you have not had time to sit down and think back to what all this killing and dying and warring was *about* and what you were doing it all *for*.

You were doing it all for the possession of India. But why possess India? Why? Is there Freedom in your possession of India? No. Is there Democracy in your possession of India? No. Is there Independence of Nations in your possession of India? No. None for India. *And none, furthermore, for yourselves.*

For what have you got out of your possession of India, you Men and Women of England? A few of you have got money out of it, lots of money, and another few have got power out of it, lots of power. These few men of money and power turned India into a slave agricultural country—but at the same time they turned England no less into a slave manufacturing country. They turned your sunny English meadows into smoke-black factory towns, and your tidy English homes into beggarly slums. And they under-dogged you until you became the poorest physical specimens of Europe. I have seen the peoples of five continents, and nowhere in the world have the people had less, and the men of power more, than in England. Nowhere in the world have so many owed so little to so few who had so much.

They let you shout your heads off in Hyde Park, for all the good it ever did you, and told you you were free, free to shout. They told you that India was the brightest jewel in the crown of the Empire, but what did the possession

of India mean to you, Men and Women of England, but slums and wars, and more slums and more wars?

For the Life Line of Empire was never your life line, Men and Women of England. Once it was a Gold Line and a Power Line for your men of gold and power. But now it has become a Death Line in which they have entangled and are strangling themselves, you, India, and the world. Any time any government anywhere makes any move in any direction, your men of power fear that this move may eventually reach India, and that they may lose their own clutch on India. They will not allow India to educate itself, free itself, arm itself, nor defend itself. Possessed India, a vast country with a vast population and vast riches, unarmed and helpless, is a basic structural maladjustment in the modern world, is the crux of 20th century wars. Until India is independent and self-armed, Asia cannot be organized for peace, and until Asia is organized for peace, the whole world must be disorganized for war, more and more war.

Cut the Death Line of Empire, Men and Women of England. Cut it yourselves; your men of power will not do it: they prefer power to life. Set yourselves free by freeing India. For you will never be free while India is slave.

As it so stoutly and resonantly swears to restore freedom and independence to the nations under foreign domination, we recall that the British Government is suppressing freedom and independence in nations under its own domination, and that the English jails of India are filled with Indians whose only crime is their belief in Indian freedom and Indian independence.¹

Frankly, we cannot believe a word you say about democ-

¹ The censorship in India is so extreme that it is the only great country in the world (almost as big as the U. S. with triple the population of the U. S.) in which no American reporter nor broadcaster has been stationed since the war; telephone communication has been cut.

racy in the dictatorships until you do something about democracy in your own imperial back yard. We appreciate your eloquence against all the heinous crimes that other governments are committing. But how about your own crimes? Your righteous indignation against the evils of the dictatorships boomerangs directly back to the evils of your own dictatorship in India.

India is the test case of your faith in democracy—and of our faith in you.

A free India means a free England: Once you are free of the senseless and insane burden of a subject India, you are at the same moment free of the equally senseless and insane burden of policing the Seven Seas. A free England does not need to police seven seas. You don't need a seven-seas fleet to defend England, or the Commonwealth. You had to police the seven seas only to hold on to your conquered, disarmed possessions. You don't need a seven-seas navy to defend the white cliffs of Dover—nobody wants the white cliffs of Dover—what would they do with them?

Once India is free, a free England does not need to kill and die to hold Gibraltar, Malta, Suez, Aden, and Singapore.

Sail your battle fleet, of your own free will, out of the Mediterranean. Leave the Mediterranean to the Mediterraneans. After all, you are not a Mediterranean people. You are an Atlantic people. Bring your fleet home to the Atlantic.

Return Gibraltar to the people of Spain with your apologies—and a check for 237 years' rent. (How would you feel if the Germans had tricked you out of Land's End and held it for centuries?) ²

² In 1704 Admiral Rooke bombarded and captured Gibraltar despite the pledges to the contrary of the English government to its then ally, Spain.

Pack up and clear out of Malta, Suez, Aden, Hongkong, Shanghai, and Singapore. Yes, a few people will lose some money they don't need, and some power they have misused. Yes, there will be a scramble for the spoils, there will be a bloody scramble, but let the local lads fight it out among themselves; after all, it's their home grounds.

Haul down the Union Jack from its flagpoles stuck in other peoples' lands. Let the bands play Home Sweet Home, and bring your boys home.

Bring the boys home because that's where you need 'em.

Bring them home to England—bring them home to Scotland, Wales, and Ireland—bring them home to Canada (which is bigger than the U. S. A., with only ten million people and less than ten percent developed)—bring them home to the great Union of South Africa—to Australia and New Zealand, also vast continents unpeopled and undeveloped.

For it is in the Commonwealth of Free Nations that your true glory lies. Here is your real achievement: the solid homespun cloth of English-speaking peoples, pioneers, builders. The Indian conquest is not the brightest jewel in the English crown—it is rather the blackest blot on the English 'scutcheon. Your Commonwealth of Free Nations is the English crown. It needs no alien jewels.

But the Commonwealth does need attention. It needs the closest attention of the best minds you can muster. For generations now, the best English minds have gone out to the service of foreign lands, just as English capital has gone out to the service of foreign lands, because there it could make a higher percentage of interest on its loans—with the result that the needs of the common English peo-

England has kept Gibraltar ever since. See Mahan's *Influence of Sea Power Upon History*.

ple on English land, as of Commonwealth people on Commonwealth lands, have been grossly neglected, and the enormous resources and potentialities of all the Commonwealth nations are still very largely undeveloped.

Men and Women of England: For over three hundred years you have waged incessant wars against all the peoples of the earth, first, briefly, to make yourselves secure, and then, for a long time, to make yourselves powerful.

In the long course of these wars, you have multiplied the territory under your domination over one hundred and forty times; you have made over four hundred million non-English people your subjects; you have become twelve times as big as the United States Empire, three times as big as the French Empire, and sixty times as big as the German Empire; you have become the biggest, richest, and most powerful empire in the history of the world; yourselves numbering less than one fortieth of the world's population, your empire covers one-fourth of the earth's best surface and includes the earth's richest resources. Beyond the boundaries of your empire, your financial and economic power dominates the whole earth; and you have achieved all this by means of many things, but primarily by means of the most aggressive, the most militant, the most ruthless, and the most successful naval dictatorship in the annals of mankind.

In the long course of these wars, you have fought, conquered, carved, and hi-jacked the Portuguese Empire, the Spanish Empire, the Dutch Empire, the French Empire, the Indian Empire, the Chinese Empire, the Turkish Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the German Empire.

Surely, Britons, for history it is enough!

Surely, even for Mr. Churchill, it should be enough!

Men and Women of England: Aren't you beginning to feel a bit fed up with the dull drudgery of policing the world, of shopkeeping for the world, of bookkeeping for the world, and minding the whole world's business? Have you ever thought of cultivating your own English garden?

You have been so sophisticated, so complex, so acute: Your men of power have been so terribly clever, so fearfully wise: such men of the world, such diplomats, such statesmen, such politicians, such economists, such financiers, such realists, such strategists, such moralists!

And where did it get you? And where did it get all the rest of us? Into two world wars in twenty-five years, into lunatic death and damnation.

Maybe you will win World War II—and grab the juiciest bits of the Italian and French Empires—just as you grabbed the German and Turkish imperial possessions after World War I. So what? So we'll have World War III.

Maybe you were too clever. Maybe you need a rest. Maybe we all need a rest.

Of course, there will always be an England. But also, there will always be a Europe; there will always be a France, a Germany, an Italy; there will always be a Russia, a China, a Japan—there will always be an India, too.

There are less than 50 million Britishers. But there are over 1,950 million Other People in the world. Has it ever occurred to you that they may need a bit of elbow room, too?

John T. Flynn

THE GREAT RETREAT

I AM asked to answer the question—is civilization in peril. I cannot answer that without asking in turn—what civilization? Whose civilization? And what do we mean by that civilization? I would define *our* civilization as the state of a free society, operating upon the theory of the rule of the people through the mechanisms of republican forms, committed to the principle of freedom in human action guarded by law and by understood and generally accepted tolerances in religion, speech and all the means of social effort. It includes traditions of social order that release the energies of the individual in all directions save at those points where his freedoms cross the freedoms of others. It implies social forms, habits, manners and attitudes within which all races mingle in understanding relationships. It includes the enjoyment of high standards of living in a society in which the production of wealth and its distribution is carried on under a system of free enterprise for profit and operating within the framework of a money economy.

If, then, you ask me, is this civilization in peril, I answer you that it most certainly is—and in the most desperate peril. And the most important question this nation has to settle now is—from what direction does this peril come.

At the moment there is a very large group of people—or perhaps I should say many groups—which for differing reasons press us to believe that this civilization is in peril

from Adolf Hitler. And, if they have any faith in their diagnosis, they must believe that it can be saved only by driving Hitler out of France, out of Germany and, perhaps, out of the world.

Our economic system is indeed in peril—but not from Hitler. The enjoyment of those liberties of the mind and spirit we prize so highly is most certainly in peril—but not from Europe. The standards of life here, the mingling of our many racial stocks, the permanence of our republican institutions are all in mortal peril. But that danger is not to be sought in either Europe or Asia. The peril we seek is here. The cancers, the infections are all here. But we have managed with extraordinary success during the last year to turn the eyes and the minds of the people away from the cancers and blood diseases that infect our social system here and to fix them upon events and disorders thousands of miles away from our own shores.

Always in our history we have been surrounded on every side by political systems and philosophies of life utterly alien to ours. Our culture, our literature, our statesmen and our political theories were the scorn of Europe. But this did not prevent us from growing stronger physically, politically, spiritually for more than a century and a half. This did not prevent the example of our vigor and of our republican virtues and energies from exciting the envy of the world and the serious study of sober statesmen, until we saw old aristocratic and despotic systems give way and those societies that held us in contempt make a beginning to imitate our ways of life.

If now, when we are a great, numerous, rich and powerful nation, we cannot hold our own and cannot preserve our civilization against the old, the weary, the fatigued and crumbling societies and philosophies of Europe including

fascism, which is an old hash served in a new dish with a new name, it is not because we have been and will be weakened by them, but because we have lost faith in our own civilization. And it is this that makes the peril which confronts us so deadly.

I find myself hearing and reading with amazement some of the strange doctrines that some of our intellectual guardians put forward to save our democracy. One of our most vocal political poets has reproached other American writers because they have aided our moral disarmament by inculcating "a scorn of war." A philosophical columnist thinks that we should create for ourselves some idyllic heroes on the Valhalla pattern—some American Thors and Odins. A popular economic writer tells America she has become soft and must get tough—take to walking and singing in the woods—a sort of Strength-Through-Joy movement. A whole drove of liberal pacifist and semi-pacifist essayists and publicists have acclaimed the glory of democratic militarism. One of our popular novelists is agitating for a Lady Militia—a sort of battalion of death—while the New Republic editors have gone so far as to favor compulsory universal civilian training—the good labor camp of Hitler's Germany. A professional radio commentator occasionally pops off with a demand for the "streamlining" of our government and for the immediate seizure of Colombia, Venezuela and Northern Brazil by the President without notice to Congress; he ends with an eloquent outburst about the glories of democracy. Another group wants America to become part of the world's greatest empire, king, nobles, colonies, debts, wars and all. Our most influential New Deal economists are forever extolling the virtues and efficiency of Hitler's financial system—without labelling it of course. Many of our so-called progressive business reformers and labor leaders are heart and

soul for the corporative state, while the idea of dictatorship—benevolent of course—has fascinated our warlike brethren almost to the point of creating one.

The truth about the matter is that what we have here in America now is not this so-called great crusade to undo the world and make it over in our own image. What we have is a great and humiliating retreat. We have lost faith in ourselves. We have lost faith in our civilization to which we pay only lip service. We have lost faith in our democracy. We have lost faith in our ability to solve the great problems that have vexed us for the last eleven years and that have paralyzed our economic system. We have quit thinking about them. We have surrendered to the despair of frustration. We have run off upon another fool's errand all decked out in glamorous words and gaudy pretensions. We are fleeing as for our very lives in an attempt to escape from reality. This episode we may well call the Great Retreat. I wonder how much democracy will be left in America when this great crusade for democracy has done its work.

The world is sick. It is down—and we are down with it—from a group of maladies—economic, social, political, spiritual. They are not new maladies but old ones. They have been eating at the vitals of the present civilization for many decades but what we have now is the cumulative effect of these diseases which have produced a crisis in our society.

These diseases are not the same everywhere of course. We have our own special brand. But the one illness which is common to the whole world—the whole capitalist world—is economic. What has happened here has happened in one way or another and in different degrees in every capitalist country, great and small.

Here in the United States our economic system is in a jam. By our economic system I mean the capitalist system—the

system in which goods are produced and distributed by private owners for profit and within the framework of a money economy—that thing which people like to call free enterprise. I need not consume any time in examining the causes or the cures. We might have many disagreements on this. But one thing at least is certain, and that is that this economic system of ours has bogged down into a state, almost, of inertia. This happened long before Mr. Roosevelt came into power. He cannot be charged with that. But it has continued and grown worse during his regime. And neither before he came into office nor since he came into office has anything been done about it.

This is an economic order which operates according to certain laws. One law at least we know, and that is that the dynamic element in this economic system is private investment. Private investment began to decline around 1928, perhaps 1927. It sank down low enough in 1929 to produce a crisis and this developed into a great major crisis and almost complete disaster in 1933.

There were plenty of abuses in this country in our business world. There were many maladjustments that required correction for purely humanitarian reasons. There were many injustices. There were people who suffered bitterly. There was the problem of relief amongst the unemployed, the aged, the helpless. But all of these problems of relief, of the correction of human injustices and the correction of moral delinquencies in business and politics—these constituted one problem. But the problem of making the economic system work, of re-vitalizing it, of getting it on the track and moving again—this was another problem and involved a wholly different collection of measures. Getting the economic system on the track again was a problem of reviving investment

and expansion and about that problem nothing was done. To this instant nothing has been done.

Instead, we did something that is as old as civilization. We did the thing that Pericles did in Greece and that Caesar and Augustus did in Rome and that Edward II did in England, that Louis XIV and Louis XV did in France, that the government of Italy did almost from the moment it was formed, that Mussolini did in fascist Italy and Hitler did in Germany; we called it a New Deal. We substituted government borrowing and spending for the internal and normal energies of private enterprise and investment and began the fatal career of keeping a great nation afloat on a vast sea of government debt. We added a vast debt of twenty-eight billions of dollars for the depression to the sixteen billions we still owe for the last war. This was not a remedy for the central disease of the system. Not only was it not a remedy but it actually added to the severity of the disease. Not only did it have no effect upon reviving private investment but it actually resulted in killing further and more definitively the whole system of private investment. We began by borrowing and spending some money for relief. Then we went a little further and borrowed and spent more to prime the pump without doing anything at all about the pump. And now we have pumped 31 billions of dollars into a continually disintegrating pump. The pump is not only no better off but is actually further out of repair, and so much is this true that a new school has arisen which now maintains that we must continue borrowing indefinitely because the system of private enterprise is dying. And it is the protagonists of this school who are now in power in Washington and are exercising a controlling influence over the policies of the nation.

Now we are embarked upon a new phase of the borrowing and spending program—the military phase. It is a very curi-

ous fact—though not so curious since it is quite old—that these vast military expenditures fall in perfectly with these novel economic doctrines of the “new school” economists. I am not guessing about this. Last November a conference was held in Washington between a group of government economists and a group of economists from business and academic circles. Representing the government were Mr. Leon Henderson, the government’s member of the Defense Commission, Mr. Mordecai Ezekiel, the economic adviser of the Agricultural Department who writes books about \$2500 a year for everybody, Mr. Gilbert, economic adviser of the Defense Commission and Mr. Rexford Tugwell. At their conference Mr. Tugwell and Mr. Gilbert and their colleagues announced that this government was going to give an exhibition, a demonstration of the soundness of the proposition that by means of a great armament program it could bring prosperity and abundance to the American people by government spending. When one of the visiting economists observed that we have been spending for eight years and have not produced recovery and abundance yet, Mr. Tugwell answered: Because we have been spending only three billion dollars a year, which is only a drop in the bucket. What we have to spend is 12 billions a year. That, of course, is what they are doing—not twelve billions a year but on armaments alone thirty billions in two years for the United States, and seven billions for Britain as a starter. And they will borrow every dollar of it save perhaps a billion or two, and add it to the then inextinguishable public debt of this country. When this experiment in supporting the economic system by borrowing and spending began, the United States government had a debt of about nineteen billion dollars. It is forty-seven billion dollars today and when the present program is completed in the next two years, it will be ninety billion dollars.

That is, if we do not go into the war. If we do that, no man can tell what it will be; and if we do not go into the war it will probably be a great deal more because we are in for a complete disturbance of the price level and a rise in the costs of this vast government program.

Now of course I know that there are good souls, whose minds are illuminated and elevated by the contemplation of the idealism of empire and imperialistic glory and glamor which is now known as democracy, who will say that all this is very materialistic. When the world is in flames this man talks about money and debts and taxes. But the world is not in flames. There is of course a fire raging in portions of Europe and Asia—large portions of Europe and Asia. But the thing that is destroying this world of ours is not a fire—that is a lot of rhetoric. The thing that is destroying this world of ours is, among other things, a disease, not a fire—a disease which has attacked the body of the European societies but which has also attacked the body of our society. And that disease is here. It is inside the body politic. It is inside its bones and its nerves and its blood. For let us remember that one of the most important of the social functions is the economic function—the production and distribution of the necessities of life, and it is that function which is being broken down inside our society here in America. The way to meet our problem is to treat that disease here and not to run to fires in Europe.

We have been, of course, busily engaged since 1933 in a so-called effort to treat that disease, but we have never touched the disease itself. Nothing ever was done. We had a social body here that was growing anaemic for want of blood—blood that would be generated inside its own organism and pumped through its system by its own heart. But we have done nothing about that blood disease. Instead we have

been giving that emaciated and shivering body transfusions of public debt. And now the intellectual philosophers of this "new school" of economists tell us that we have not been giving it enough transfusions, that we must increase the transfusions at least fourfold, that we must keep it up forever. We may be said to be passing, if this thing endures, into a state of perpetual enervation, kept alive by the pouring of oceans of synthetic blood into our dying frame under what might be called the transfusion school of economics. It is this economic blood disease which cause so many of these ulcers and sores and other bodily ills that we have been observing and that are symptoms of a grave disease.

Of course growing wheat and cotton and making bread and clothing are very materialistic things. So are decayed teeth, weak eyes, infected tonsils in a child. But all sorts of moral delinquencies can be traced to these very material defects. Societies too must have these very material things—their calciums, their fats, their proteins and their vitamins. Ill-fed and ill-housed millions, distraught and profitless enterprises, populations which have lost hope, are ripe for economic and social parasitic plagues like fascism and communism.

But it would be a mistake to say that all the trouble arises out of economic disorganization. For some reason, which we need not examine now, something has gone wrong morally and spiritually in our political and in our business organization. Apparently we have not been able to find the best forms, the wisest techniques, for administering our democracy in the interest of all the people. We have seen the gravest and most shocking corruption, the most scandalous exploitation of the people. There is something almost grotesque in our quixotic proposals to carry democracy to all corners of the world, with the planes we have not got and the tanks

we have not yet produced, when right here in America we see the American people, after one hundred and fifty-three years of republican education under our Constitution, surrendering the government of their States and their cities into the hands of criminals and gangsters. Never in our history has the public service been more debased. Never in our history has the practice of mass purchase of communities been practiced on so bold and so extensive a scale. Just as the Federal Government is living upon vast borrowed sums now, so our cities and States have been flourishing for two decades upon extravagant programs carried out with huge debts which render thousands of them financially impotent to carry on further improvements. In many ways the same thing has happened in business. The story of the 1920's was a hectic tale of commercial and financial graft and brigandage that ended in an almost terrifying collapse of the whole fiduciary relationship upon which this economic system must rest. The truth is that we have sinned. We have sinned against our high ideals, our high pretensions. We have inflicted deep and perhaps mortal wounds upon our civilization, and we were busy delivering these blows to ourselves and our society before Adolf Hitler's name was ever heard of in America.

Now, what has happened here has happened in Italy, in Germany, in Spain, in France and in England, all over the continent of Europe. The economic systems of these countries were subjected to the same fatigue. They began far sooner than ours in America to reveal the same maladies. In Italy, which must go down in history with dubious immortality as the cradle of fascism, their society began to exhibit all of the weaknesses of the capitalist economy from the moment the nation was organized. With the exception of a very few years, Italy before the last war lived upon

deficit after deficit. The mounting debt became the great and perplexing and continuous irritant of Italy's political life. Minister after minister promised to correct it and minister after minister piled it higher until by the time the Great War broke over Europe the impoverished people of Italy were being drained by the tax collector and the enervated economic system was being more severely stalled by the mounting public debt. The new Italian nation embraced the principles of parliamentary and free government, but all the old corruptions of the Italian states continued upon an even more destructive scale. Justice in Italy became a mockery—there was no such thing. The result of all this was that by 1914, when the first guns were fired by the Austrians at Serbia, Italy, sunk into the most degrading poverty, ravaged by the most corrupt political system and crushed under the most burdensome debt, had utterly lost its taste for democracy—such as it had. And the whole nation was in a tumult and ready for social revolution.

The truth is that throughout Europe there was the same economic problem as we had because there was the same economic system and the same unwillingness to deal with that problem. But in Europe the problems were complicated and intensified by other factors. Europe was and is poorer. A large number of smaller states possessing utterly inadequate resources have been incapable of carrying on the functions of a modern technological capitalism. Age-old racial and religious and dynastic feuds have divided these peoples, filled them with suspicions and hatreds, built psychic barriers around their frontiers along with the trade barriers which kept them from the free use and interchange of their products. Along with all this went the curse of imperialism. All the great nations of Europe—France and Russia and Germany and Spain and England and Italy—

have in turn asserted the baleful doctrine of racial superiority, have claimed the right to seize and rule any people weak enough to be conquered. Every people in Europe has lived in terror of its neighbors, and every important nation and some of those not so important have roved over the world like great national brigands, imposing their rule and their government upon other peoples in Asia and Africa, exploiting them, robbing them, slaughtering them, often doing it in the name of Christianity. And of course they have quarreled about this loot and they will continue to quarrel about it, for all these corrosive forces—poverty, racial, religious and dynastic feuds, imperialist ambitions and quarrels throughout the world—superimposed upon the same economic and social difficulties that we have here, have made their problems seemingly insoluble. To add to all this, all of these countries have, during the last twenty years, struggled against the burdens, the disorganization and the exhaustions of the last war. Thus exhausted, thus beaten down, the hopeless and despairing people of that unhappy continent have turned to this new school of messiahs, these fascist dictators who have promised to heal their wounds and to revitalize their economic systems, to revive their national pride and to give them security and abundance. The real trouble in Europe is not Hitler. It is these terrible social diseases that have produced Hitler and that have produced not only one Hitler but many Hitlers. For there is a Hitler not only in Germany, but in Italy and in Spain and in Greece and in Turkey and in Russia. Now there will be a Hitler in France; before this terrible chapter is done, England, which has been more concerned with the problems of her national pride and her empire than with her democracy, will have a Hitler too.

There is a war raging in Europe, but there have been

other wars in Europe far more destructive and savage than this one. What makes this war so terrible is that it breaks upon a more terribly disorganized and maladjusted social and economic system than the last war or innumerable other wars before it. There is this war, to be sure. But there is also a wind blowing through the world. The most serious thing for us is not the war, but the wind that is blowing—the wind that is beating not only against the houses of Europe but our house as well; houses once built upon rocks, but rocks which have turned to sand. The primary and most terrible mistake that we are making is to suppose that we can save our house from the wind that beats against it by fleeing to the defense of other houses in other lands that are menaced by the same wind. We can abandon our house and turn all our efforts to saving some other man's house, but the wind will still be blowing against us. We will return from the storm in that other neighborhood to find that our house is falling, if not already down, and that saving the other one had no effect upon our own. Our problem is here in America facing with courage and a spirit of sacrifice the disorders that are here. But we are no longer interested in the enemies that are here. We have grown weary of fighting them—our real enemies—the enemies that are destroying us. We are running away from them. We are deserters. We are in full and ignoble retreat.

I sympathize deeply with the plight of the peoples of Europe. Their plight is indeed far worse than our own because they are further stricken in the disease that is upon us. These people are not fighting for democracy. They are all fighting for existence. But they are fighting for existence not against the armies that are in the field for the moment, but against invisible enemies—enemies far more deadly that were there attacking them before the armies marched and

that will be there, stronger and more savage than ever, when the armies have demobilized. We do not know what to do about our own less deadly disease here within our own frontiers where we have all the resources, all the wealth, all the powers and all the freedoms to do whatever is necessary. We know still less what to do amongst those numerous peoples of differing culture and genius and in more advanced stages of decadence. If we continue to neglect our problems in order to follow the quixotic course which so many have marked out for us, if we continue to pile on the debts, to live on red ink, to pile on the taxes, to paralyze the primary dynamic energies of our economic life, we will soon find ourselves as badly off as the peoples of Europe. But that is precisely what we are doing. We have set up in Washington a government that is pursuing a strange, contradictory, ill-ordered and fantastic policy. I would not care if the forces at Washington were frankly socialist, putting together a socialist regime. That at least would make sense, for there is a definite philosophy at the base of socialism. I think I could understand it even if it were communism, for that too has a well-defined structure of principles and administration. Indeed, I think it would make sense if it were honestly fascist, for, brutal, forbidding, ugly, and revolting as fascism may be to our American mind, it has nevertheless a fairly well understood and defined technique. But what we have is none of those things. It is neither socialism, communism, fascism nor capitalism. It is nothing. It is a hodgepodge of ancient devices supported by one energy and one energy alone—the ancient stratagem of national debt—and, bewildered, stumbling, spendthrift, it is blundering into war and carrying us and all that we have and all that we cherish into war with it.

We are shouting brave shibboleths about liberty and

democracy. They mean nothing. This whole episode is an escape—the escape of a puzzled and frustrated—leadership away from one set of ills it does not understand and cannot deal with to another set of ills that it is not equipped to meet and that will in the end only multiply the fundamental troubles from which we suffer. I repeat—it is an escape, a retreat from reality, from meeting with courage the high duty of preserving the heritage of freedom of one hundred and thirty millions of our people. It is not a crusade for democracy. It is not a forward charge to bring freedom to other parts of the world. It is a blind and unreasoning and a humiliating retreat. Before it is too late let us halt in our flight, stand, come to our senses, re-form our forces, and move again to the performance of a duty that is worthy of the highest traditions of our history—the duty of preserving the liberties of a nation of free men.

Igor Sikorsky

THE NATURE AND THE OBJECTIVES OF THE SOVIET COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT

THE beginning of war between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia has shifted the center of gravity of the whole conflict not only with respect to the number of men participating, but also with respect to the character of political and ideological consequences involved. The whole past record of the Soviet Government indicates positively that it will use the results of any military success for the promotion and expansion of its own ideology, methods and objectives, and not for the defense of any democratic freedoms or Christian ideals. Therefore, the entry of the Soviet dictatorship into the war changed the situation considerably from an ideological as well as from a military standpoint. Whatever the outcome of this new phase of the conflict, German attention and military power will be so much occupied with policing or defending itself from the major part of Europe that there can be no question of any attack upon this country for at least the life time of one generation.

Therefore, sending our men to fight in or around Europe would mean, not a defense of the safety and ideals of America, but the defense of the British Empire and, equally, the defense of the safety, power and ideology of the Soviet dictatorship. This being the case, it appears to be important at this time to review briefly the history of the Soviet Government as well as its true nature and objectives.

It must be remembered that the Bolshevik group gained power not by fighting the Imperial regime but by overthrowing a very advanced democratic government which several months earlier had replaced the Tzarist administration. This liberal Provisional Government already had proclaimed Russia to be a democratic republic, had introduced universal equality of all citizens, before the law, had abolished all former distinctions, and had introduced and passed a whole series of advanced democratic and socialistic legislation.

One of the first steps of the Provisional Government was to make arrangements for a general election of the members of the Constitutional Assembly that was expected to begin its sessions late in the Fall of 1917. Furthermore, it must be understood that the cruel and bloody civil war which marked the introduction of the system of unspeakable oppression and terror which later became a part of normal life under the Soviet government was not at all connected with any acts or resistance of the Imperial Government. The following facts must be taken into consideration in order to understand the true cause of the civil war.

For several decades prior to the revolution, practically all of the liberal, radical, socialistic and labor parties, including the Bolsheviks, declared that the fundamental objective of their struggle and aspirations was the possibility of electing freely, on the basis of the democratic formula of universal, direct, equal and secret balloting, an all Russian Constitutional Assembly that would have power to decide the future constitution of Russia, to determine the form of government, to distribute the land to the peasants, and to arrange in a proper way the position of the workingman, etc.

In March, 1917, Tzar Nicholas II renounced the throne

in favor of his brother, the Grand Duke Michael. The latter issued a statement declaring that he would accept the crown only if this were the will of the Russian people expressed through the medium of a freely elected, all-Russian, Constitutional Assembly. This act eliminated the possibility of any monarchist counter-revolution and cleared the way for a peaceful transition from the old order to a most advanced democratic republic, which actually was proclaimed in the Summer of 1917 by the Provisional Government.

During the Spring and Summer of 1917, the radical groups and particularly the Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin and Trotsky, abused the unrestricted freedom that was granted by the democratic Provisional Government and organized an intensive, vicious propaganda throughout the country and in the army, calling the soldiers to disobey their officers and to desert the front in order to conquer the land from the landlords and the factories from their owners. As a result, a profound disorganization took place. The best men and practically all officers remained at the front facing the German army, while the worst, the demoralized, cowardly and treacherous ones deserted the front. About one hundred thousand of them accumulated in Petrograd and probably as many in Moscow. Of these deserters, as well as of the idealistic but deceived young workingmen, the Bolsheviks organized their original Red Guard and with its help succeeded in overthrowing, in October 1917, the inactive, democratic Provisional Government headed by Kerensky.

Meanwhile, the elections were completed and the members of the Constitutional Assembly arrived in Petrograd to begin the sessions. The Assembly was overwhelmingly liberal and radical, but the majority belonged to the party of

the Socialist Revolutionaries, which had more support from the peasants, while the Bolsheviks were supported mainly by the extreme, radical labor groups and were in the minority. The sessions of the Constitutional Assembly were started and continued for a few days until the Bolsheviks, who had captured the government a few weeks earlier, ordered their Red Guard, composed mainly of deserters, to disperse the Constitutional Assembly.

The rough destruction of the Constitutional Assembly, which was for decades considered as the limit in aspiration and a supreme authority by all liberal and democratic groups and parties, caused an outburst of protest from the majority of the population. In Petrograd, a huge demonstration was staged, but the Bolsheviks dispersed it with their Red Guards, using machine guns and artillery, and killing and injuring many hundred unarmed men and women. It was the dispersal of the Constitutional Assembly which destroyed the chances of democracy in Russia, made the civil war inevitable, and sent the unfortunate nation on the road to oppression, violence, terror and immense suffering.

It must be realized that the terrible cruelties and violence of the Soviet Government are not connected with lack of education, illiteracy or poverty; in fact, in the far away villages where the poor, uneducated peasants lived, there was very little or no violence. The poor people in the villages were frequently the ones who offered shelter and help to the victims of the terror. The unspeakable mental and physical tortures and murders were introduced, not by the uneducated or under-privileged, but by the fanatical, atheistic intellectuals and by the half-educated Marxist revolutionaries of which a very large number, including most of the leaders, spent much time outside of Russia.

A study of the development and the course of events in the Russian revolution clearly indicates that the movement, which was started with certain declared objectives and ideology, at a very early stage underwent a series of catastrophically rapid changes that replaced the original ideology and objectives with completely different, often absolutely opposite ones. A most important factor, however, must be noted,—namely, that these changes were confidently and with striking accuracy predicted by several Christian observers. At the present time, when the atheist revolutionary ideology and actions have been given nearly a quarter of a century of trial, it must be recognized that the severe and tragic statements of Dostoyevsky proved to be a prophecy of nearly unequalled accuracy, while the expectations and confident predictions of more or less atheistic leftist supporters and sympathizers of the Marxist movement proved to be wrong to a greater extent than probably any forecast of a large sized movement that was ever attempted.

In an effort to penetrate beyond the abundance of outer historical facts toward the true inner meaning of this tragic event, we will use the testimony of some modern philosophers and writers whose sensitive spiritual being was capable of perceiving and formulating the inner truth.

An outstanding modern Russian philosopher, Professor I. A. Iljin, summarized recently the nature of the revolutionary process in Russia. The following lines are quoted from one of his statements made in 1940:

“The upper level of Russian life became occupied by a generation of men that were grown in the revolutionary underground; men with mutilated souls from which the whole spiritual side of existence became dried and faded out. All that is from the spirit does not exist for them: faith, prayer, love, conscious-

ness, honor, freedom, personality, family, right—all this is rejected, is being thrown out, is being crushed. From all the democratic love for the 'under-privileged brother' these men preserved nothing except their hatred of the bourgeoisie. Their revolt against exploitation and slavery became transformed in them into a lust for becoming themselves slave owners. The legendary honor of the fighter degenerated in them into a lust for a general infamy. . . . And accordingly, a man became to another man as a wolf. New waves of men were coming on us with an arrested wicked glance, with a quick deadly stamped out rattling instead of a speech. . . . And from their glances, words, crooked smiles, half illiterate signatures under the orders and decrees *the living tissue of life started to fall to pieces and to disappear*. Everywhere there came desolation, poverty, piles of scrap, piles of dirt, hunger, sickness and death. . . . The Communists themselves were unable, as well as unwilling, to understand the connection between the cause and effect in these phenomena and accepted them with irritation and rage. They were threatening and murdering. This created fear and abhorrence, but could not revive the spirit and the creative will. The wickedness carried with itself death. Hatred was arresting the creative process of life. Envy tried to get hold of what was available, but was unable to create anything new. The godlessness was destroying. . . ."

Professor Iljin clarifies his statement by the following important remark:

"In describing all this, I am not speaking about the first years of the revolution; I speak about the very foundation of its communistic substance. This foundation has not disappeared; it will remain until the very end, which means as long as the power would remain in the hands of these spiritual corpses."

Professor Iljin is well-informed as to the situation in Russia and his statement can be considered as scientific expert testimony about the inner nature of a certain phenomenon. It is in good accord with the observations of

another reliable and competent eyewitness, I. L. Solonievich, who escaped from Soviet Russia not long ago. This man, a son of a Russian peasant, has resourcefulness, courage and outstanding physical strength. He had no title or property to lose, and he managed to get along much better than the average person can do under the Communist regime. He is not at all sentimental, is ready to give credit even to the Soviet where he believes that credit is due. He is interested, primarily in realities and facts and knows them because, as a leading physical instructor, he visited many parts of Russia and frequently had to work in cooperation with large groups of people as well as with various Soviet leaders and institutions. He summarizes the present situation in Soviet Russia in the following manner:

"The process is extremely contradictory and complicated. The Soviet Government created an instrument of coercion of such power as history has never yet seen. This coercion is counteracted by a resistance of almost equal strength. The two formidable forces are at grips in a tragic struggle of unequalled intensity. The government is approaching the breaking point under the strain of its problems while the country is suffocating beneath unspeakable oppression. Power is on the side of the Government, numbers on the side of the people. The line of demarkation is traced with such sharpness as usually happens only in cases of a foreign invasion. The resultant struggle recalls the atrocities of the Middle Ages."

This statement includes very important information which is seldom realized because it describes conditions that are so completely unusual and abnormal for this twentieth century.

The fundamental principle on which the Communist government maintains itself in control is this division and mutual hatred which are promoted and maintained among the grown-up men and even among the children.

This information was supplied by eyewitnesses. It is interesting to compare it with the inspired, prophetic ideas written by Dostoyevsky about half a century before, when the ugly inner nature of a godless Marxist revolution remained almost universally unrecognized and unexpected.

In his novel, *The Possessed*, Dostoyevsky tells about a meeting of radical, atheistic revolutionists during which one of the leaders presented to the rest a plan for organizing human society on a new basis. In his introductory remarks the leader admits that his theory includes contradictions, that having started with the idea of complete individual liberty, he finally arrived at the necessity of unlimited despotism. He added, however, that his theory is the only method by which human society can be arranged in a reasonable way on the earth. The proposed plan, briefly, is as follows:

All of mankind must be divided into two unequal groups—the small group of about one-tenth of the total must be given all rights, liberty and unbounded power over the remaining nine-tenths of mankind. This latter group must be deprived of all rights and liberty, must give up all individuality and become reduced to a state similar to that of a herd of animals. By gradual transformation, this larger group of mankind, through boundless submission, would be reduced to the mentality of children and would live in a sort of primeval childish paradise. However, they would be compelled to work. As a method of putting the plan into operation, the author suggests the destruction of morality, the abolition of property, the abolition of home and family, the selective extermination of any person of higher ability or talent, and so forth.

In explaining further these ideas, the leader states the following:

"The main thing needed in the world is discipline. The thirst for culture is an aristocratic thirst. The moment you have family ties or love, you get the desire for property. We'll destroy that desire; we'll make use of drunkenness, slander, spying; we'll make use of incredible corruption; we'll stifle every genius in its infancy. . . ." ¹

In these prophetic lines that were written before 1881, Dostoyevsky described the division of mankind into two parts, and the introduction of mutual distrust, spying and hatred as a cornerstone of the proposed new Communist society. This idea, fully confirmed by the two eyewitnesses quoted can also be clearly recognized in certain writings of the leading Communist author, the talented Maxim Gorki, who was a staunch supporter of the Bolshevik Government and a close friend of its highest executives. In an article describing the personality of the founder of the Soviet regime, Gorki writes:

"Lenin is a man of exceptional power. For twenty-five years he remained in the front of the fighters for the triumph of socialism. He is one of the greatest personalities of the international socialist democratic party; a man of talent he has all the qualifications of a leader, including the necessary absence of ethics, as well as a purely lordly ruthlessness with respect to the life of the popular masses.

"Life in all its complexity is unknown to Lenin, he does not know the popular masses, never lived with them. But he learned from books how to get these masses enraged, how to infuriate their instincts. . . . The working class for the Lenins is a material like the ore for a metallist. Is it possible under all circumstances to cast from this ore a socialistic state? Apparently, it is impossible, but why not try?"

This sentence was written by Maxim Gorki, a personal friend of Lenin and Stalin. While expressing exactly the

¹ *The Possessed*, Part Two, Chapters VII, VIII.

same ideas as Dostoyevsky, Iljin and Solonievich, Gorki stresses them even more strongly. He obviously admires and approves of the powerful dictator with the "lordly ruthlessness and the necessary absence of ethics." But the popular masses are regarded in this sentence not even as human beings. The expression, "to get them enraged and to infuriate their instincts" is more suitable to animals than to men, while the next sentence compares the multitude of living human beings simply to a metal ore. The tears and blood of millions of living men, women, and children have obviously no meaning for the lordly spiritual corpses who are ready to do everything to satisfy their insatiable lust for power. The talent of Gorki permitted him to make a truthful description which discloses the boundless viciousness of a Godless Communist dictatorship in such precise and bold terms as has seldom been done by the most severe opponents of Marxism and Bolshevism.

It may be noted that besides the main idea, every major detail predicted by Dostoyevsky finds its fulfillment in some reality of the Red Revolution. Dostoyevsky writes that men would be forced to "give up all individuality," and in the Soviet life we find a new word, "obezlichka," which means "depersonalization." (See *New York Times Book Review* of February 9, 1941.)

The modern writer, Merejkovsky, independently records precisely the same fact. He writes:

"The Bolsheviks, irrespective of the class or nationality to which they belong, always remain Bolsheviks . . . and everywhere act in a similar way. . . . They have one aspiration—the murder of human personality."²

Dostoyevsky writes about the destruction of family and the "use of incredible corruption." Joseph Douillet, the

² *The Kingdom of the Anti-Christ*, page 203.

former Belgian Consul who spent most of his life in Russia, including ten years under the Marxist regime, states the following:

"During the years of Communist rule, a generation has grown up subjected to the disintegrating moral influence of the Communist ideology . . . the Bolshevik propaganda against the family, against respect for old age and religion, together with the Bolshevik condonation of vice, sexual immoderation, self-will and lawlessness, has borne fruit. A wave of immorality has inundated the country and penetrated everywhere. . . ."³

Dostoyevsky further describes the ideas of a revolutionary leader by quoting him as follows:

"He suggests a system of spying. Every member of the society spies on the others, and it's his duty to inform against them."

In the *New York Times* of January 6, 1935, we find the following headlines summarizing the main ideas of the article:

"A traveler analyzes the system which makes every citizen of the Soviet Union a detective and permits the government, acting through the political police, to impose its will on all."

In line with this discussion, it is necessary now to make a further study of the most important phase of this movement, namely, the character and methods of its anti-religious activities.

Lenin has said in his works (Vol. XIV, page 70) published by the State Publishing Department in Moscow in 1929:

"We must fight against religion. This is the A, B, C of the whole materialism and consequently of Marxism."

³ *Moscow Unmasked*, by Joseph Douillet, page 123.

It must be borne in mind that the most intense hatred of the Communists is directed not against the clergy but against religion in general and particularly against the fundamental principles of Christianity. The fight against religion, the frantic attempt to drown it under a flood of mockery and violence, represents one of the main, officially established objectives of the Marxist government. This work has a large budget, it is served by periodicals and books that are printed at the government's expense; it is promoted by individuals and societies that are encouraged and subsidized by the government. The godlessness and mockery over religion are energetically introduced and spread among school children.

I have in my possession a book entitled *The New Testament*, by Demian Biedny, who is an official writer directly connected with the Soviet Government. The book, edited by the official Soviet Government printing bureau, is 158 pages long and must be regarded as one of the greatest blasphemies ever spoken or written. The book consists of reasonably long quotations from the Gospel followed by a few pages of verses in which the same Gospel event is presented as a mockery, which is blasphemous to the extreme and frequently so obscene that I consider it impossible to make quotations. Judas Iscariot is the only person described in a friendly way. Besides being published as a book, this composition was also printed by installments in one of the largest papers, *Pravda*, which, as well as other papers, is edited by the government. The Soviet Government also printed thousands of anti-religious books, a number of periodicals, with cartoons of most blasphemous and insulting character.

As to its direct actions, it must be borne in mind that no other dictatorship, except that of Loyalist Spain, has

even remotely approached the cruelty of persecutions and the number of victims. Many thousands of clergymen, as well as tens of thousands of ordinary men and women, were murdered by the Soviet Marxist Government frequently subjected to ugliest mockery and torture before being killed for their Christian faith.

It is regrettable that well-meaning people often trust naively the radical propaganda which explains the unspeakable cruelties of the Reds as a consequence of the illiteracy and poverty of the people in pre-revolutionary Russia. It must be understood and realized that in the Communist dictatorship, after two decades of existence, mass murder and torture are still the normal methods of administration applied calmly as routine procedure by the ruling class of Marxist Communists, who are neither poor nor illiterate, but are godless, immoral and inhuman.

The nature and principles of the Communist dictatorship are, of course, reflected in its official legislation. For instance, one of the articles of the penal code reads: "The giving of religious education to children shall entail one year of forced labor." There is a law that makes attempts to escape from Russia punishable by death. In the Spring of 1935, the Soviet Government issued a decree which made the death penalty for theft applicable to children above the age of twelve. This law is extensively used in cases of stealing food from government supplies, but it is also applicable to the case when a peasant conceals some of his own grain to feed his children. A number of other laws of similar nature could be mentioned to illustrate the officially established rules of life; however, the realities of the existence of human beings under the Communist dictatorship are still much worse.

The following few facts and figures may serve as a sum-

mary of the acts and accomplishments of the Soviet Communist Government. During less than 25 years, it destroyed between 25 and 40 million human lives. It holds several million men in concentration camps under conditions of unspeakable mental and physical suffering. Of these convicts, 200,000 lost their lives during the construction of a single canal from the Baltic to the White Sea. By mangling and crushing human families, the Soviet Communist Government is permanently throwing on the streets multitudes of children who become homeless. The majority of them die during the first year from hunger, exposure, and beatings, while the rest become terribly demoralized and maintain a miserable existence by forming gangs and stealing food.

There is incomparably less freedom and justice, and the economic conditions for the vast majority of the population are much worse than they were before the revolution.

With the exception of Loyalist Spain, the Communist dictatorship murdered at least ten times more men and hundreds of times more defenseless women and children than all other European dictatorships taken together. No fairminded intelligent person, and particularly no Christian, has the moral right to disregard these facts.

The direct participation in the present war would make the United States automatically an ally of the Soviet Communist Government. Moral and material help, which in this case would become inevitable, would be given by our country to the Communists in order to strengthen them and to help them to fight successfully, not only Germany, but any other nation which they may decide to attack. Any military success would result in the reoccupation of several small, mostly democratic, countries, namely, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, parts of Poland and Bessarabia. Such reoc-

cupation would inevitably be followed by cruelest mass murder. If our direct assistance or sufficient pressure on other fronts would later enable the Communists to achieve a still greater victory, they will undoubtedly move further into Europe, probably into the Balkans and Scandinavia, possibly still further, organizing and utilizing the scum of the local population in all these countries and marking their entrance in the usual Communist way by unspeakable cruelty, violence and murder.

In a conflict of such magnitude, a small, defenseless nation may be forced into an alliance and may have no opportunity to consider the moral standing and ideology of a big power that would simply dominate it under threat of brutal force. With the United States, this is obviously not the case. We have all the power, wealth, and an outstandingly favorable geographic position that enables us to preserve a dignified independence and to protect our country from any aggression, as well as to defend our legitimate economical interests in time of peace. Therefore, if we willingly and by our own choice join ranks with the godless Communist murderers and help them by direct moral encouragement and material assistance, or by coordinated pressure on other fronts, then we will become the associates or, more correctly, the accomplices in acts that can be foreseen and predicted with accuracy on the basis of their ideology and past performance. If the Government of the United States were to commit such an act, it would be a betrayal of the very foundation of Christian idealism.

Burton K. Wheeler

WHAT IF GERMANY SEIZES THE BRITISH FLEET?

DURING the past month or two I have travelled some 7600 miles through more than twenty states. I have addressed public meetings from one end of this country to the other. Whether it was business and professional men in Cincinnati, workers in Denver, farmers in Sioux Falls, miners in Butte, merchants in Boston—everywhere, East or West; it was the same—the American people are firmly resolved to avoid this war. Dr. Gallup may publish polls which indicate that American public would approve convoys. He may, with the approval of Secretary Stimson, poll our armed forces. Of course, that venerable warrior, Mr. Stimson, expects a satisfactory result. He knows that every American soldier, sailor or pilot has been fully informed about the fate of General Hugh Johnson and Colonel Lindbergh when they dared express their views. But, if I know anything of public sentiment, or the temper of the American people, I fear the fate of those who would take them into the hell of war today.

These crowded, overflow meetings from Boston to Denver were composed of a cross section of the population. They were not pro-nazi, pro-fascist or pro-communist. They were simply pro-Americans. They like myself were sympathetic with the English people. No blood but English flows through my veins or any of my family. And next to

being pro-American I am pro-English. I greatly admire the English. Unlike us they have never been accused of being sentimental suckers.

Lord Palmerston said, "England has no eternal enmities and no eternal friendships. She has only eternal interests." An Englishman loves England first. I only wish there were more Americans who loved America first.

When the Willkie Crusade to preserve the Chinese way of life flopped, Lord Halifax was rushed into the middle west. Talk of subversive activities, speak of fifth columnists—what brazen effrontery!—a British Ambassador touring the United States to arouse our people to sacrifice their sons and their treasure to save the British Empire. The American people resent this abuse of diplomatic courtesy. They resent it just as they resent the untiring efforts of the royal refugees to plunge us into war. They know that these royalists did not give their subjects the democracy they now implore us to save. They know that these royalists did not solve the economic and social problems in their lands. They know that when cannon roared and death rained from the skies, these royal refugees seized their gold and departed for safer lands. They left their subjects to do the fighting and dying they would now have us do. Yes, the American people are idealistic; but theirs is a practical idealism, one that cannot be pandered by propaganda. The American people would like to see the four freedoms established throughout the world; but first they want freedom from want in the United States; first they want freedom of speech and freedom from lynching in Florida; first they want the four freedoms firmly and irrevocably established in this nation.

Pleas for war from Secretary Stimson have fallen on deaf ears. In 1916 and 1917, Mr. Stimson conducted his first

campaign for war. Then the Kaiser was going to invade the United States, invade this land with 330,000 men and 40,000 mules. A year ago Hitler was going to invade us at any moment with ships. Today, according to Secretary Stimson, the invasion will be from the air. The American people recognize Mr. Stimson for what he is, an able, genial gentleman, 72 years of age, who is utilizing every device to get this country into war. I do not question his patriotism. I question his good judgment. What is there about war that so many of our elder statesmen want you to fight?

Other high ranking officials have vainly pleaded the war-makers' cause, but all to no avail. Finally the Secretary of Agriculture was rushed into the field. He journeyed to the heart of the farming country where he promised the farmers parity prices and luscious government subsidies on the one hand, and, on the other, wanted them to come to war. But the American farmer and his wife are no Judas Iscariots—they will not sell their sons into war for thirty pieces of silver.

The American people are still moved by noble emotions, but they learned twenty-five years ago to their eternal sorrow that there is no idealism in war. They learned and President Wilson learned that economic or political spoils, not humanitarian impulses, govern the conquerors. They saw Democracy sacrificed on the altar of international selfishness—exchanged for more territory and reparations.

Today, the war-makers and all those who would so willingly sacrifice another's life to preserve the British Empire tell us we cannot live in a world dominated by a dictator. How familiar that statement is to patriotic Americans. Our forefathers carved a democracy in a world of autocratic monarchies in 1776. Less than thirty years later a great conqueror unleashed his armed might against England and

against most of Europe. Then a Boston anglophile, Fisher Ames, declared, "Great Britain is fighting our battles and the battles of mankind, and France is combatting for the power to enslave and plunder us and all the world."

The Tories of today who would engulf us in war for Great Britain had their Tory forbears. How easily could the word Germany be substituted for the word France in the statement of John Lowell, who prior to the war of 1812 said, "All thoughtful men know that Great Britain alone stood between us and that slavery which would be our portion if France should prevail."

Today our war-makers in frightened tones and with a tremor in their voice pose the question, "What if Germany seizes the British Fleet?" They imply that all would be lost. They suggest that we would suffer an immediate invasion, that Panzer divisions would roll down Broadway, and that parachutists would be landing in Montana. How fantastic! How utterly ridiculous!

With all my strength I affirm my confidence and my faith in the United States of America. I hold this nation's safety as dear as any man. We are no small, trembling, spineless nation. We are strong and growing stronger. We are mighty and becoming mightier. No nation dependent upon another is or can be an independent country; those who parade as Americans but who tell us we are dependent upon the British Navy are unworthy of the name American.

True, the United States can breathe easier as long as the British Fleet survives. It is a luxury to our defense; it does implement our naval power—so long as the United States and Britain cooperate and have no controversies.

We are building a two ocean navy. It will protect this hemisphere. Except for a few units it will be ready for service within two years. Unless Hitler can invade this

hemisphere within the next few months, he could never do it even though he captured the entire British Fleet and the remainder of the French and Italian Fleets. This is not idle talk from a swivel chair expert—ask any top ranking, active, working American naval officer.

Let us examine the facts: If Hitler seized the British Fleet tomorrow, years would be required in which to train crews and officers to man these ships, and to reach the high state of effectiveness of our Navy. Each man must be trained for his task; many of these require the greatest skill and long experience. Likewise to command and to maneuver fleets demands years of study and then more years of drilling aboard ship. And each of these planes, submarines, and ships must drill with others before a fleet has been trained for action.

Hitler has no fleet now, and he will not have a fleet until long after we are ready for him.

It is inconceivable that the British Fleet would ever come into Hitler's hands. In 1918, the Germans sank their whole fleet rather than to deliver it to England. Without the British Navy it would take Hitler at least seven years in which to build a fleet equal to ours.

To invade South or North America, the invader must have a tremendously superior fleet. It is significant that the British and French Navies never attempted a coastal invasion of Germany. They always chose land operations.

Any of our naval experts will tell you the German Fleet today is inconsequential for invading purpose. The British have humbled the Italian Navy. For Hitler to attempt an invasion of the Americas would be suicide. Transports require fleet protection. Unprotected, a German transport with its small guns would be easy prey for the American Navy. German submarines are small. They were designed

to operate close to their bases, within a few hundred miles of England. They could not be used to accompany transports in any great number.

American submarines are large. They were built for long range. They can cross the Atlantic and return without refueling. They could harass and sink transports over the entire route. No invader could maintain a supply line from Dakar to South America or from Berlin to New York. American bombing planes protected by fighters would meet any invaders. Fighter planes, incapable of long distance flights, aboard carriers would be the only real protection against these American bombers. And the number of foreign carriers is few, so few that they represent no serious problem.

Assume that the Germans captured the British Fleet; assume that they had developed a powerful navy; assume that they had the airplane carriers necessary to protect the fleet from bomber attacks—where would they get the ships to transport the troops? Two or three thousand transports for men, another thousand ships would be required to carry the heavy tanks, the motor vehicles and the military supplies that would be necessary. Today it is doubtful whether Germany could obtain a hundred small transports. She almost has been reduced to using tugs and barges from the Rhine. It is barely possible that with complete mobilization of shipping, Hitler could transport a hundred thousand men. No army of a 100,000 can invade the United States. Why, we would blow them to bits.

If we go into this war to win, it means we will be the ones to provide the 3000 transports which do not exist. We will be the ones who must carry our bombers and fighters thousands of miles. It will be we who attempt to land in Europe against entrenched forces, giant cannons and the air might of Germany. We are the ones whose transports will

be vulnerable to the short radius of active German submarines, speed boats and aircraft based on nearby German, French and Spanish ports. That will be different—far different—from repelling any invading force of this hemisphere.

Thus a cold, dispassionate analysis of the facts explodes the fanciful threat of a military invasion of the Western Hemisphere. We are safe now—and for years to come. But the war-makers are undaunted. They have conjured another threat, the threat of an economic invasion. And to those who preach economic defeatism, I say, as I said to their craven hearted allies who fear Hitler will soon be on Broadway: Have faith in American industry, in American labor, in American business, and in American genius. They are all first class. Free American industry is superior to controlled Nazi industry, free American workers can produce more than Nazi slaves, and I know that American business men are smarter than any Nazi competitor.

If the economic history of the world proves anything, it proves that low wages and slave labor cannot compete with free labor. American wages have always been high—and we have always competed and held our own in world trade. Chinese factories, owned and operated by the British, with cheap coolie labor, have never been a real threat. In India most factories are equipped with modern English machinery. The great majority of the executives and technical experts are British; the cheapest labor is employed; yet India is no economic threat.

The plight of India's workers is tragic. Go there as I have done; see them earn a few pennies for their day's labor; see them spend it for the cheapest food; see them asleep at night on the public thoroughfares, on streets and on side-

walks, with only boards or concrete under them, and nothing over them except the heavens and the British flag.

Cheap labor, slave labor, is no match for free workers. If it were, England, who controls the world's largest low wage reservoir or supply, would dominate and monopolize world trade.

I am not afraid of any of these imaginary threats conjured by those who want to take us into a jolly war. I am afraid that if President Roosevelt repudiates his election pledges to the American people—not to take us into a foreign war—that the American people will lose faith not only in their President but in their government.

I am afraid that if our national debt grows greater and greater, we will resort to debt repudiation or inflation. I am afraid that if the President accepts the advice of that little coterie who surround him, most of whom have never faced an electorate, or met a payroll, or tried a law suit, and many of whom are impractical dreamers, he will wage an undeclared war. Then, Constitutional democracy will end.

I am afraid that when American boys return from Singapore, Dong-Dang, Bombay, Dakar and the Red Sea, armless, legless, maimed and insane, and when other American boys return to seek jobs when there are no jobs, they will be embittered and disheartened. Some of them will seek those who said election pledges of peace were mere campaign oratory.

I fear the aftermath of war. A post-war period is far more threatening and dangerous to this democracy than any foreign military or naval force. Should we enter the conflict, we would become at that moment a regimented nation. We, as individuals, would be subordinated to one person, the Commander-in-chief, and to one objective, the

waging of war. From such a state, democracy could hardly be restored. Our men and women, disillusioned, disheartened and even destroyed mentally and morally, amid economic chaos and social dislocations, would turn to the man on horseback. Then—and not before—would there arise little American fuehrers and from them would come one native fuehrer, an American Il Duce, an American Hitler.

Tonight the war-mongers and their satellites demand that President Roosevelt assume leadership in their crusade of blood and destruction. They decry his leadership because he has merely taken us to the brink of war. These sordid romanticists, jingoistic journalists and saber rattling bankers in New York criticize the President for barely keeping his promises. Only war—blood, sweat, tears and destruction—can satisfy their lust.

The workers, the farmers, the business and professional men, people from every walk of American life, look to the President for leadership, for another brand of guidance. They are not alone. The people of all the world look to Franklin D. Roosevelt. They look to him with upturned faces, with prayers on their lips and hope in their hearts. They see him, a symbol of liberty, a champion of the down-trodden; they see him as their knight, a leader for peace.

These people are realists, they are not dreamers. English mothers, Italian mothers, German mothers know what it is to have sons fighting, killing, destroying. Certainly all thinking people, the world over, understand the cost and futility of war. They want peace, peace before all the people of the world and civilization are doomed, before they sink into a common grave.

The President of the United States could appeal to the world for peace; he could appeal not to Hitler or to Mussolini or Churchill but to the people of Germany, Italy, and

England. He could demand that the war-makers, the Hitlers of Germany, the Churchills in England and the Knoxes and Stimsons step down and out. I believe he could dictate the peace of the world if he would. But first he must rid himself of those war-makers that surround him, who refuse to understand the wishes of the people.

The American people demand that American influence be diverted from the channels of war to the channels of peace. They demand that restitution be made for the bloody and unfilled promises of former Ambassador Bullitt and Colonel Wild Bill Donovan. The American people know that Bullitt promised Poland we would enter the war, while President Roosevelt was promising our people continued peace.

The American people know that it was Colonel Donovan's promises that sent Yugoslavia into battle. All this they know; and as practical idealists they now demand peace. If American war-makers are really interested in preserving the British Empire and the British navy, they, too, will join and work for peace now.

The tremendous power, present and potential, of the United States, lent to the cause of peace, might well stop this heartless slaughter of humans and this needless destruction of property. With the destiny of mankind in the balance, the time has come to act, to act for a just peace, not in the interest of the British Tories or imperialists, not in the interests of power or land hungry dictators, but in the interest of all the people in the world.

Tonight most of the world is engaged in bloody battle. I ask in behalf of millions that the President of the United States, at the risk of being called an appeaser, appeal to all the people of the world to stop War, now, before it is too late.

Norman Thomas

WHY OUR COUNTRY SHOULD STAY OUT OF THIS WAR

THIS article has been begun on a Fourth of July. It is written from a heart devoutly thankful that our independence still means freedom from the madness and anguish of belligerent participation in a war in which three quarters of the world's population are involved.

The vast majority of all the peoples who are its victims had nothing to say about the issue of war or peace, and little to say about the policies which have brought such woe upon them. England uses Indian troops to achieve her imperial purposes in a Syrian quarrel which is of no possible concern to the half-starved people of India. France at war makes similar use of African and other colonial troops.

The peoples of Europe are scarcely better off. Italians, Germans and Russians are puppets in their dictators' hands. Only the Americas are at peace.¹ Yet we in this favored land frantically—and inefficiently—arm for wars that need not be ours. Day and night our eyes and our ears are bombarded by hysterical propaganda of Cabinet officials, college presidents, newspaper editors, columnists, and radio commentators to put us into war. We are asked now, or

¹ Three days later Ecuador and Peru renewed an old boundary war. Still later an armistice in Syria brought temporary peace in the Near East. But the basic situation was unchanged.

as soon as we can get ready for it, to make war's devastation universal, to throw away the independence our forefathers gave us, by involving ourselves in a struggle which threatens the suicide of western civilization and the biological impairment of European stock, perhaps for generations. Already one man, the President, has virtual dictatorial power to put us all the way into undeclared war without even consulting Congress or the people. Day by day he brings us nearer the abyss.

Why should these things be in our land of hope? The answers are many and varied. They come from men and forces in curious alliance. (Indeed, on both sides of the interventionist issue, we must confess to strange bedfellows.) We are told that we must fight to save England, the British Empire, the U.S.S.R., China; our own independence or way of life, or at least our world trade; a decent civilization, the Christian religion, or President Roosevelt's four freedoms—as yet nowhere completely established, certainly not in our own land.

If it is somewhat uncertain what we must fight *for*; it is generally agreed that we must fight *against* Hitler. Mr. Sumner Welles, as Acting Secretary of State, made the one statement on which practically all interventionists (except the Communists who are far more concerned for Russia than for America) might agree. In explanation of the Administration's readiness to aid Stalin, he declared: "Hitler's armies are today the chief dangers of the Americas."

It is precisely this which I would emphatically deny. In a dangerous world, far and away the greatest danger to America would be our belligerent participation in Europe's and Asia's wars. Thus would we lose a democracy we could not possibly bestow on mankind.

To say this is not to deny that Hitler's armies are a

potential danger to America. Still more surely is Hitlerism, or more accurately Naziism, a danger to America as it is to all mankind. Any and every kind of totalitarianism is a danger to the noblest way of life. Despite my earnest wish to believe the contrary, I have been driven by the pressure of inescapable facts to regard Stalinist Communism as in no way preferable in balance of good and evil to Hitlerism. Indeed, in the very doubtful event of a complete victory over Hitler, Stalin would soon become at least as much of a danger to true American democracy as would a victorious Hitler. Through his Communist organization he would have a far greater international appeal.

But today Hitler seems the more probable victor, and Naziism is at present the best organized and most aggressive expression of the ruthless will to power. To a terrible degree it has made duplicity and cruelty principal instruments of government, and servants of the monstrous dogmas of the master race and the god-state.

Yet before we rush to plunge our country into war on the easy assumption that military victory will rid the world of totalitarianism, we should at least reflect that Naziism is not simply the expression of the diabolical power of an evil genius, but the product of a war won by the democratic nations, avowedly for democracy. We conquered the Kaiser, to get not the thousand years of peace we had been promised, but, in due course, a more terrible war against a far more intolerant despotism. Naziism, and indeed all forms of totalitarianism, represent a failure, both of the method of war and of the old capitalist and nationalist order, to provide men and nations with the security they crave. And since this order which failed so disastrously called itself "democratic," the revolt against it, both in its communist and its fascist form, was anti-democratic.

Clearly, the old order was for us greatly preferable to the present state of the world, but merely to restore the order which bred Hitlerism in Europe would doom us to new wars born of new failures of that same order. Of one thing, however, we may be certain: no military victory will restore the old order in a world already swept far down the paths of social revolution as well as of war.

Those of us who vehemently oppose America's entry into war are abundantly justified in reminding our fellow countrymen of these facts which are the more significant because the leaders of the new crusade for democracy, Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt, have been far less explicit than was Woodrow Wilson in proposing any use of victory for such reorganization of Europe or the world as would make new wars and new tyrannies unlikely.

Nevertheless, the case which we must work out ourselves and present to our countrymen cannot rest exclusively on these considerations. Rather it must be based on our estimate of relative dangers in a world in which no course of action leads to any sure harbor of safety.

There are genuine idealists among the interventionists. But it is not they primarily who can put us into war, still less guide the war and make the peace, but rather the propagandists of hysterical fear, the deluded believers that one more victory for Anglo-American arms will save private capitalism, and the still more dangerous advocates of an Anglo-American imperialism. Our quarrel with the idealists among the interventionists arises not so much out of differences in our ultimate aims, or in our appraisal of the crimes of the Axis powers; it arises out of our study of the relation of the means we are asked to use to the ends the idealists tell us we are to seek. That fact can be made clear by an analysis of the possible outcomes of American bel-

ligerency in this war. They fall under one of four general heads:

(1) Our military intervention may not be effective enough to prevent Britain from making peace under bitter compulsion, or possibly on the attraction of desirable terms, leaving us to fight alone. It should be remembered, in this connection, that to fight a war thousands of miles from home, a war on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic, in Europe as well as in Asia and Africa would require a force of trained men which we have not yet created; a navy about twice the size of our present navy, and an equipment in planes, tanks and guns of which we possess from ten percent down almost to zero of what is essential. While we are assembling these supplies for ourselves, it is probable that in certain respects there would be a reduction rather than an increase of the aid promised to Britain under the seven billion dollar grant of which so little, comparatively, has already been supplied.

(2) Another possibility, which is to me more probable, is that the only victor in the war will be exhaustion. The same oceans which all honest military and naval experts agree make invasion of this continent, and even of this hemisphere so nearly impossible, make it unthinkable that we can successfully land armies on European or Asiatic soil. Yet without such expeditionary forces the complete victory we are bidden to seek is impossible. We owe thanks to the British Generals, Wavell and Auchinleck, for telling us this so frankly. On the very day I write these lines Columbia's correspondent in Cairo broadcasts that the British forces in Africa momentarily expect the coming of our men.

Our entry into the war by prolonging it in time, and extending it in space, will greatly increase the impact of hunger upon the children of Europe. It will mean that for

years rather than for months the horror of bombing on both sides of the English Channel will be intensified, and the resultant shock, added to hunger, may well reduce the next generation in Europe to a state beyond salvation by the perfection of any formula of peace. Once I thought that Stalin, if he could keep out of the vortex of war, might pick up the pieces of western civilization. Now Hitler's attack upon him make it a virtual certainty that one of two dictators, equally cruel and perfidious, will be the master of the continent of Europe. Even a stalemate sufficient to give rise to a general revolution in Europe would hardly make that revolution conform to British or American interests or ideas of democracy. A war fought to the point of exhaustion in order that Stalin rather than Hitler should master most of Europe and Asia is not worth the life of a single American boy.

(3) A third possibility would be a negotiated peace this side of exhaustion. It has been my fortune to hear a number of more or less influential interventionists admit privately or to small groups that they did not really expect a "complete victory," similar to that in 1918, such as they have led the public to expect. All they hope from our entry into the war is a chance of negotiating a better peace. For this small hope they are willing to gamble the lives and destinies of one hundred and thirty million Americans. They would have us fight in order to negotiate later on, although they are vehemently opposed to any suggestion of negotiating now in order, at least, to find out for what we would have to fight!

(4) The final possibility is a victory for Anglo-American arms so decisive that we could impose virtually our own terms of peace upon the world. The Russian war makes such a peace a little more likely. It makes it very much

more likely that the British Empire will remain virtually intact. We should be fighting not for the homes of England but for complete "victory" for war aims not yet defined. The mounting spirit of hatred of Germany and Germans, as well as of Hitler and Hitlerism, together with the rising wave of imperialism convinces me that we must expect, in the event of decisive victory, a peace more stupid and imperialistic than that at Versailles. No other opinion can be derived for instance, from Senator Pepper's ravings, or the aspirations of Henry Luce and the "Union Now-sers" for an Anglo-American alliance in which we will take the role of senior partner in the name of God and for our own profit, in policing the most desirable parts of the world.

Such post-war imperialism will of necessity in these times conform far more to the German model than to the easier going and more profitable British imperialism of the 19th century. It will probably invite conflict not only with colonial peoples, and jealous rivals, but with our junior partner, and certainly our ally, Stalin. Imagine a peace made by Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt—even with Dorothy Thompson as adviser! Certainly that peace with its post-war imperialism will require us to organize our own life on totalitarian lines at home and to maintain a far greater military establishment than rationally would be necessary according to the estimate of so sound a military expert as Hanson W. Baldwin merely for the protection of this continent, or even of this hemisphere, against successful attacks.

There is absolutely no ground for the Pharisaic belief that whereas German imperialism is harsh and cruel American imperialism would be just and tolerant. We have a great tradition which imperialism would deny. Moreover it is a simple and humiliating statement of fact that the worst charge against Hitler is that he is doing to men of the white

race what through generations we English speaking peoples have done, and to a large extent are still doing, to our fellow men of colored races in this hemisphere, in India, and in what the generally pro-British writer, Albert Viton, correctly calls "Britain's slum empire," in Africa and the West Indies. In particular, our American record is one of racial prejudice and proneness to violence in a land of lynching mobs, the Ku Klux Klan and strike riots more costly in human lives than many a *coup d'état* abroad.

In dozens of speeches in different parts of the country I have presented substantially this analysis of the situation, and not once has any opponent or critic tried to refute it in any detail. Neither have they seriously disputed my statements of the unimaginable costs of total war in human lives and economic resources. Their expression of hope that an unpopular, inconclusive and costly war can be waged without killing democracy during its duration, and provoking a terribly confused, bitter and fascist reaction at its end, are completely unconvincing—I suspect even to themselves. With singular unanimity they have sought to evade the certain and tragic consequences of our entry into this war by concentrating attention on the less certain dangers to us of a Hitler victory. These dangers they have pushed to hysterical extremes.

The President, himself, initiated this sort of campaign for an inchoate and unthought-out program of armament economics, and ultimately of war in the famous address to Congress and the nation in May, 1940, in which he told us that we could not defend Omaha against bombers traveling from Berlin by way of Brazil, Mexico and the Mississippi Valley on a tourist schedule for fair weather travel. Yet in the hearings of the Lend Lease Bill in 1941 no single witness under pressure seriously maintained that there was

any real likelihood of invasion of our shores by way of Brooklyn, Brazil or the Bering Straits. If I do not pause to give figures to show what immense forces and what enormous armadas would be required for such invasion it is only because other contributors to this volume will do that job so adequately.

The present argument of the war-makers dwells upon the danger to us of Nazi interpenetration in South America. Such danger doubtless exists but it is grossly exaggerated as can be seen from a military angle by considering such a moderate statement as Hanson W. Baldwin has given in the book to which I have already referred. In general Carlton Beals' picture of South American conditions in his book *Pan-America* suggests that the problem is one of statesmanship, of the right sort of cooperation with the Latin-American countries, rather than of sheer military power. At this very moment members of Congress and commentators who interpret hemispheric defense in terms of the right and duty of the United States to develop military power for protective occupation of any part of the hemisphere—a military goal verging on the impossible—are actually inviting not only the South American dictators, but the South American people, whose friendship supposedly we are cultivating, to contemplate deals with foreign dictators as a counter weight to the might of "the Colossus of the North."

At this point the military and economic fears of the interventionists merge. Wendell Willkie and others who nurture the two fold delusion: first, that our prosperity if not our very life depends upon a world trade and especially a South American trade, impossible if Hitler wins; and second, that a British victory will or can restore the old type of trade, are giving about the worst of reasons for imposing on the United States the horrible cost of war.

Again I assume that other contributors to this volume will deal more at length than I with this subject. Let me, therefore, content myself with saying that while, of course, I believe in the value of world trade, a country as richly blessed as ours, whose foreign trade has not normally been more than six or seven percent of its total, can far more surely achieve prosperity by cultivation of what Charles Beard has called the "open door at home" than by nurturing world trade by war and for war. I should rather see our Boy Scouts organized to salvage tin cans than to see their older brothers die for the tin of Bolivia or the East Indies. (The reader who wishes a sane treatment of the subject of our comparatively easy access to raw materials, or to substitutes for them, at a price infinitely less than participation in this war, will do well to consult that reliable book, *The Strategy of the Americas* by Messrs. Reynolds and MacLeish.)

The truth of the matter is that after this war even a victorious Britain would be forced to trade in South America much as Germany would trade, that is under a system of glorified barter with state direction. The process had begun before the war. I do not think that American economy need be so weak and defeated that it cannot cope with this new situation in South America or elsewhere.

Greater than a military peril of a German attack upon us across thousands of miles of mountains and jungle from Brazil over the Caribbean, which is becoming an American lake; greater also than the economic peril which the master of a sullen Europe can direct against us, is the danger of the conscious or subconscious imitation of fascist success. I grant that that danger will be very real in the event of a Hitler victory. Even more serious will be the danger that in the name of defense we shall go in for a degree of arma-

ment which will inevitably jeopardize our achievement of any economy of abundance, and be of itself a standing invitation to undertake imperial aggression. I can only say that these dangers are not unconquerable unless our nation is already defeated in its inner democracy. There is no law of God or the devil which will compel a great nation with our resources to copy a dictator temporarily successful, in another hemisphere. We should never have had an American democracy if our ancestors had not dared to found it on the edges of a wilderness in a world of despotisms.

In the long run it is dictators and dictatorships who have something to fear from their own people, if here on this continent we Americans will make our own democracy work. To do that we must prove that we can keep and increase liberty, and still cooperate to harness machinery for the destruction of poverty more successfully than Hitler has harnessed Germany's men and machinery for the conquest of Europe.

To do this will not be easy. It can be done, and in the doing of it lies all our hope and mankind's. It will not be done by an industrial order which, having failed to expand to meet human needs, turns like a moth to the flame to the expansion of armament economics and war. It will not be done by those who would find America's destiny in any form of imperialism. It can be done by men and women dedicated to the achievement on this blest continent of a fellowship of free men who will use their science and technological skill for peace, not war; life, not death.

While we work out this destiny we cannot of course isolate ourselves from the world. We shall, on the contrary, be in a better position to help to bind up the wounds of the victims of war and fascism. At peace we can restore hope in America as a land of asylum—a hope which the same

Administration so unnecessarily impaired avowedly for fear of spies. With this new attitude, the American Government and people, sooner perhaps than we think, can find a way to mediate in behalf of a peace at least more promising than an indefinite continuance of war. Properly to discuss that hope lies beyond the scope of this article. Dreams of the immediate achievement of a perfect peace, or of a practicable and desirable world *government*, in the strict sense of the later term as implying a world state, are romantic and even dangerous. World government would of necessity today be highly centralized and unmanageable, except perhaps by military dictatorship. The notion that we with our own unsolved problems of racial and economic justice can and should fight on and on in hope that we can starve and bomb the world into wisdom sufficient to support a world government is fantastic madness. Approaches to world *cooperation*, and ultimate federation, especially in certain economic matters like access to raw materials, is another thing. The will and the wisdom for such approaches are far more likely to come from an America which will keep its sanity in peace than from an America that has plunged into the cataclysmic destruction of war.

What I have been trying to say in a few sentences must be elaborated by many minds. But not even a brief statement of my personal reasons for throwing myself heart and soul into the struggle against war would be valid if I did not indicate that for me success in keeping America out of this war is the indispensable beginning, but only the beginning, of the struggle to make our own democracy work. And that, in turn, is part of the struggle to remove the causes of war and to find a substitute for the horrible and self-frustrating method of war.

It is a dangerous world. At best the road ahead is beset

with perils. But before us are opportunities for a happiness such as human society has never known; a happiness based on a cooperative conquest of poverty by the use of the very technological equipment which today threatens any desirable civilization with war's destruction. That is the conviction that should steady and inspire us in the day by day struggle to keep America out of war.

Robert A. Taft

SHALL THE PRESIDENT MAKE WAR WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF CONGRESS?

ONE great fundamental issue today divides the American people. There is complete agreement on the building of an army, navy, and air force which will forever make this country secure from attack. There is complete agreement in detesting Hitler and all the things for which he stands, and in extending aid to England in every manner short of war. But on the question whether we shall intervene in the European War by military or naval action, there is a vital and fundamental difference of belief. The policy which the United States finally adopts today on this grave issue will affect its future for generations to come.

I have often stated my own views. I believe that the peace and happiness of the people of this country can be best secured by refusing to intervene in war outside of the Americas, and by establishing our defense line based on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. I believe that the difficulty of attacking America across those oceans will forever prevent any such attack being even considered, if we maintain an adequate defense on the sea and in the air. I believe that air power has made it more difficult, not easier, to transport an army across an ocean, and that conquest must still be by a land army.

By the same token, it is almost impossible for the British and ourselves to march to Berlin. Only yesterday Mr.

Churchill said, "We believe it to be in our power to keep this bombing process going on a steadily rising tide, month after month, year after year, until the Nazi regime is either extirpated, or better still, torn to pieces by the German people themselves." That seems to be an admission that attack by land is impossible. I have always said that the best aid we can give Britain is to furnish countless airplanes until they can do to the German cities what the Germans have done to the British cities. But I believe in the end we would have a negotiated peace; better than England could now secure, but probably with a Hitler dominant on the continent. In the light of the bombing of England, the heaviest that any nation ever suffered, what evidence is there that bombing can extirpate a people or a regime? "Year after year," says Mr. Churchill—that is until all the evidence of civilization built up for centuries in both warring countries is destroyed, and the people are stricken and impoverished.

If we are going to permit our emotions and our sympathies to draw us into European wars, we will be involved in this war for "year after year," and in other wars for years to come. If we permit a supposed national policy to involve us in war in Europe, and we should succeed after many years in crushing Hitler, we would have to police Europe or maintain the balance of power there by force of arms. The entrance of Russia into the war illustrates graphically the fact that this is no war between the democracies and the autocracies; that it will never establish the four freedoms throughout the world; that it involves national and racial animosities which have existed for centuries in Europe and will exist for centuries to come. Furthermore, our intervention in the World War failed to solve Europe's problems; in fact we helped bring about the present situation;

and it is unlikely that our intervention will ever solve those problems. Europe must work out its own salvation, and we have no power, even if we have the will, to be its savior.

I know that my belief in this matter, like any belief, may be wrong, but millions of people agree with it. If we are a democratic country, then this great issue should be decided by the people or the people's direct representatives. I am convinced that if the question of war is submitted to the people by referendum, or if it is submitted to their representatives in Congress, a great majority will speak for peace and aid to Britain, but against war. If I am mistaken, I am quite prepared to support without stint and qualification the wishes of the majority of the people as declared by Congress; but I deny the right of the President to take us into war against the wishes of the men, women and children in the cities, in the towns, and on the farms of America; and I desire to record my strenuous protest against the policy which step by step is gradually and deliberately involving us in war without authority from Congress.

Every public-opinion poll shows that the people of this country oppose the policy of the war party, which has so large a following among the newspaper editors and columnists. Every poll which has been taken shows that the people are four-to-one against war. There has been published today the most authoritative of these polls, undertaken by a committee composed of Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago; Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick; Raymond Kent, President of the University of Louisville; Henry Noble MacCracken, President of Vassar College; Alan Valentine, President of the University of Rochester; Ray Lyman Wilbur, President of Stanford University; and Reverend Albert W. Palmer, President of the Chicago Theological Seminary. This committee caused a careful survey

to be made, on the sampling principle used by the Gallup polls, during the week ending July 3, 1941. The sampling covered the entire country, every income class, geographical section, age, race, sex, and other features of the adult population over twenty-one years of age. It included five thousand samples, more than is used in the ordinary Gallup survey. To the question "Do you believe that the United States should enter the war as an active belligerent at this time?", 20.3 per cent of those expressing opinions said "Yes", and 79.7 per cent said "No". This is almost exactly the same as the returns from the Gallup survey, the *Chicago Tribune* poll, the *New York Daily News* poll, and others.

But the committee asked a further question, reading, "If you do not believe that the United States should enter the war as an active belligerent at this time, under what circumstances do you think the United States should go to war?" The answers to this question indicate that 65.6 per cent of all those polled are only in favor of going to war if this country, or its citizens, or their property, or the Western Hemisphere are attacked. Only 34.4 per cent of the people want to go to war even if England is being defeated. The war party today is struggling hard to explain away this great majority for peace, and is exerting every effort to change that public opinion. But the administration is avoiding every direct issue in Congress. It did not dare submit to Congress the question of convoys or the occupation of Iceland. Yesterday it was announced that it would not press the bill to authorize the use of draftees and National Guard outside of the Western Hemisphere. One day the President sends American troops to Iceland in the war zone. The next day he refuses to submit to Congress the question whether troops should be sent to foreign lands. That is not democracy.

How should the issue of war and peace be decided? By the President or by Congress? There can be only one answer to that question. The Constitution confers on Congress alone the right to declare war; deliberately, because the founders of our government felt that on this solemn issue of entering into an aggressive war, no matter how well justified, the people's own decision must prevail. They knew too well that throughout history war had been the weapon of monarchs, often employed to direct the people's attention away from their troubles at home. In the Hutchins poll to which I have just referred, the people were asked specifically "Who do you think should decide whether or not the United States should take any action that is likely to involve us in a shooting war?" 70.4 per cent felt that Congress should decide this vital question; only 29.6 per cent thought that it should be submitted to the President. If the peoples of this world were freely to decide whether they would engage in war or peace, there are few nations indeed who would vote for war. There can be no insurance of peace in the future better than a determination now that questions of war and peace shall be decided by the people or by their representatives.

The occupation of Iceland indicates a deliberate policy to involve the United States in war without congressional action. A week ago Monday the President of the United States notified the Congress that forces of the United States Navy had already arrived in Iceland in order to supplement, and eventually to replace, the British forces stationed there. This action was taken in accordance with an understanding reached by the President with the Prime Minister of Iceland, frankly inspired, however, according to the Prime Minister, by the British Minister to Iceland, who explained to him that British forces in Iceland were

required elsewhere. The President agreed to the Prime Minister's stipulation that the United States forces must be strong enough to meet every eventuality, and from the various press reports it is likely that at least eighty thousand American boys, the finest in our Army, are in course of being sent to Iceland.

A lot of newspapermen write as though Iceland were an island off the coast of Maine. Take down your atlas and look at the map. Iceland is not quite as far east as Ireland, but it is much farther north and just about as far away, on the other side of the Atlantic. It is twenty-four hundred miles from any American territory. Historically and geographically, Iceland is a part of Europe, and we are therefore now intervening in Europe. For the first time we are sending American soldiers and sailors into the midst of the war zone. One of the great battles of the war, between the *Hood* and the *Bismarck* was fought off the coast of Iceland. We are relieving eighty thousand British soldiers for action at the front, and therefore for the first time taking an active military part in the war between England and Germany. Iceland lies only six hundred miles north of Scotland and Ireland, and only seven hundred miles from Norway.

In the first place, the President's action is a distinct repudiation of his express promise made to the American people only eight months ago, when he said repeatedly during the campaign, "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, Naval or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack." It is quite true that new circumstances may arise which could justify a change in policy, but surely that change must be submitted to the people, or at least to the representatives of the people, who elected the President

after hearing his promise that we would not send our Army, Naval or Air Forces to foreign lands.

Not only was the occupation of Iceland in violation of the President's pledge to the people, but in my opinion he has no legal right to send the Army to Iceland under present circumstances. There is, of course, no question that the Constitution confers the right to declare war only upon Congress. It does not confer this right on the President. Those who are trying to promote a Presidential war and to avoid submitting the issue to the people, argue that the President has power to begin a war because he is Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. It may well be true that the President has it within his power to make war without authority from Congress. Since he is Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, if he wants the Army or Navy to go anywhere in the world, they will obey him. But this does not mean that he has any legal, moral, or constitutional right to begin a war without authority from Congress. The mere fact that power may be usurped is no evidence of legal right.

The war party points to many instances in which American forces have been landed in different countries without a declaration of war by Congress, and some cases where war has resulted. But the distinction seems to be a very clear and definite one. It is a distinction between genuine defense and the making of aggressive war. Thus the President has, without the approval of Congress, the right and the duty to resist insurrection, as Lincoln did in the Civil War, and to defend against invasion. If another nation makes or declares war on the United States, it is the President's duty to carry on that war. The President has the duty to defend American life as well as American property. Most of the instances in history of the use of American

forces abroad have been for the purpose of protecting American life or American property. But the landing of troops in Iceland cannot be justified on that ground.

Furthermore, the occupation of Iceland cannot by any reasonable stretch of the imagination be construed to be defense of the United States. Conceivably it could be considered defense of the shipping lanes to England and Ireland, but passage of American ships over those lanes is now forbidden by the Neutrality and Lease-Lend Acts. It is not defense because Germany is not attacking us and we are at peace with Germany. Germany has made no physically hostile move in the direction of the United States. Even if Hitler made such an attack, he has no fleet with which he could possibly attack this country, so that the idea that we are defending ourselves from Germany by seizing Iceland is ridiculous. The German fleet on the thirtieth of last June was about one-fourth the size of the American fleet. The fleets of Germany, Italy and France together are probably smaller today in view of their losses than the American fleet, and we know that a fleet, to attack across an ocean, must be twice the size of the defending fleet. Furthermore, the German, French and Italian fleets are not built for offensive warfare across an ocean. They have practically no air-carriers, and their cruisers are mostly built for the Mediterranean use.

It is said that over many years the Germans might build up a fleet big enough to attack the United States. But under the agreement with Iceland, we have promised to remove our entire forces from Iceland the moment the present war is ended. No one has even suggested that Germany is going to attack this country without subduing England, and there is today only a remote possibility of any such result. Furthermore, if Germany did control the

entire Atlantic Coast of Europe and the British Islands, Iceland would be a liability to us rather than an aid to our defense. Under those improbable circumstances we might easily lose the entire force of eighty thousand men whom we are sending to this remote outpost. They would be within easy reach of attack from Ireland or Scotland. We could not possibly send our fleet to the Arctic Circle to defend them because that fleet would have to remain in the Caribbean or on the Atlantic Coast. The ships which we could spare would be inferior to the ships that could be summoned for attack, and would be three times as far from their base.

If the occupation of Iceland is defense, then any act the President cares to order is defense. If he can send troops to Iceland on this ground, he can certainly send troops to Ireland on this ground. He can send them to Scotland or England. He can send them to Portugal. These countries are no farther away than Iceland, and now it could be claimed that we have to defend our own troops in Iceland. After lunching with the President, Mr. Willkie is already advocating American bases in Ireland and Scotland. It is now officially admitted that under the Lease-Lend Act Americans are constructing naval air bases for Great Britain in Northern Ireland. These bases would be most convenient for us if American troops are sent to Ireland. The occupation of Ireland would relieve perhaps a half-million British troops for service elsewhere, and put a half-million American boys into the British Islands. A base in Ireland would be much more effective to protect shipping than a base in Iceland. Every argument that has been used for the occupation of Iceland applies to Ireland and England and Scotland and Portugal.

It is no answer to say that the President is Commander-

in-Chief of the Army. That does not give him unlimited power. There must be some limit on that power or nothing would remain of the Constitution. Certainly nothing would remain of the power given Congress to declare war. It is entirely clear that the President could not send an American Army to Germany today unless Congress declares war on Germany. If, when two foreign nations are engaged in war, the President sends troops into one of those nations, or territory occupied by it, in order to defend that nation or territory against the other nation, it is exactly similar to a direct intervention in the war. The mere fact that the troops are not ordered to attack does not make them less a part of the force engaged in war. It is exactly as if we had sent an Army to France in the beginning of the war to garrison the coast ports and maintain the lines of supply. It would be a tremendous stretching of the Constitution to say that without authority from Congress the President of the United States could send millions of American soldiers to Europe when there is raging over that entire continent a war which may at any time engulf that American Army. There is no case in American history which compares to the landing of troops in Iceland. It is not defense of America or American property. It is beyond the power of the President without authority from Congress.

The real purpose in seizing Iceland is not defense of the United States, but defense of ships going from North America to Great Britain. The President justifies his action by stating that a German occupation of Iceland would be a threat against all shipping in the North Atlantic and against the steady flow of munitions to Britain, which he says is a matter of broad policy, clearly approved by the Congress. In other words, he claims authority under the Lease-Lend Act. He claims in effect that in his discretion

the policy approved by Congress in the Lease-Lend Act makes the defense of Iceland the defense of the United States.

I would be inclined to agree with this position as far as sending of munitions to Iceland is concerned, but not American soldiers, for the Lease-Lend Act expressly disclaimed any intention to send troops anywhere to effect its policy. Section 10 of the Act reads, "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change existing law relating to the use of the land and naval forces of the United States, except insofar as such use relates to the manufacture, procurement and repair of defense articles, the communication of information and other non-combatant purposes enumerated in this Act." Could Congress have made it any more clear that the policy of aid to Britain or any other nation was not to be used as a justification for sending land or naval forces abroad? Yet the President does not come back to Congress and ask for this authority. He deliberately ignores their express wishes in spite of the fact that only Congress, as representatives of the people, has power to declare war.

The Lease-Lend Act cannot be used as a justification for the convoying of vessels or the delivery of defense materials in Great Britain. In that Act the word "transfer" was expressly amended by inserting the word "title" to indicate that no physical transfer was being authorized. The Act expressly provides that nothing in the Act shall be construed to authorize the convoying of vessels by naval vessels of the United States or the entry of any American vessels into a combat area. If American troops are to be sent abroad, or American naval vessels are to engage in convoying, the only constitutional and democratic procedure is for the President to ask Congress to change the policy it established and adopt a diametrically opposite

policy. But the President does not dare ask Congress to do that.

It is the American people who have the right to decide whether their sons shall go out to war in the air, on the sea, and on the battlefields of Europe; whether the tremendous sacrifice and tragedy of war are to be preferred to a possible Hitler victory in Europe and a possible Hitler threat against America.

It is natural that the war party should be anxious to accomplish their purposes without permitting Congress to act, because they are fearful that a majority of the people desire peace. But their proper remedy is not a presidential war. They have the right to persuade the people by reason and by argument that war is desirable. I may be wrong in my views; the war party may be right; but the result ought to be determined by the people calmly on the basis of facts and logic, and not on the basis of emotion and imagination.

But let the question be fairly debated. We are subjected today to all kinds of propaganda. Some comes from Germany and some from Britain.

The war party itself is very active in what might be called scare propaganda. Hitler is to arrive tomorrow, by way of Iceland and Greenland, or by way of Dakar and Brazil, or by way of Siberia and Alaska. No military or naval expert will admit the possibility, but many people are really frightened. Recently pictures were published of big Diomedes Island in Bering Strait, only five miles from American territory, upon which a great Russian air base was supposed to be constructed. I have a report from the Coast Guard that one of their cutters went up there last summer, and found that on the entire island there are six Eskimo shacks, one lighthouse, also used as a weather-

report station, and a small house for the lighthouse-keeper. The entire top of the island is covered with huge boulders. From that point it is fifteen hundred miles, through trackless forest, without roads or railroads of any kind, to the nearest Russian town of any size. There is no more possibility of Germany attacking us through Alaska than across the Atlantic Ocean.

But there is a more dangerous type of smear propaganda, designed to silence the arguments of those opposed to war. Men are called defeatists because they think it unlikely that the British can ever march to Berlin, although they are extremely confident that America can never be attacked. The real defeatists are men like Secretary Knox, who proclaim that this country is too weak to defend itself without the British fleet. Men are called tools of Hitler, and accused of treachery to America, because they are unwilling that America go to war in Europe, though strongly favoring aid to Britain and eager for the defeat of Hitler. Appeasement is the yielding to one demand in the hope of avoiding others. Men are called appeasers, though no demand has even been made on the United States, and no one is in favor of yielding to it if it is made. *The real appeasers are those willing to condone one warlike action by the President in the hope that he will not take another.* Could there be a more unfair smear than the attack on Senator Wheeler because he predicted the seizure of Iceland? Ninety-five per cent of the transfer of troops still has to be made and Wheeler gave no more notice of this transfer to the Germans than the President himself. Such intolerance is destructive of democracy, because it involves the suppression of free speech and of public opinion. It tries to prevent the presentation to the people of facts and

arguments, absolutely essential for the development of a correct decision.

The opponents of war are accused of destroying unity among the American people, simply because they disagree with the war party on a fundamental question of policy which has never been decided by Congress. There is just one way to secure such unity—that is to submit the issues to the people, or the representatives of the people, and determine what a majority desires. The American people is strongly imbued with the feeling that the majority must rule. Once majority opinion is really known, there will be unity in the policy determined just as there has been complete unity on the actual policy determined by Congress in the Lease-Lend bill, strong as was the opposition to the passage of that bill.

On June twenty-eighth, Senator George of Georgia, Democratic Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, supporter of the Lease-Lend bill, pointed out the proper road to national unity. He said, and I join with him a hundred per cent in his terribly forceful statement:

“The way to national unity is to give our people the assurance that when we are called upon to move into the actual range of fire and send our men there, whether on board naval vessels or in aircraft, the American people themselves will have some opportunity to pass upon that question; in other words, that they will have the ultimate decision, through the machinery to which they have become accustomed, and the only machinery which they have at hand; will be able to pass upon the question of whether an actual state of war shall be brought into being or a formal declaration of hostilities shall be made by the people of the United States. If they are given such assurance, and the hour comes when we are called upon to make further com-

mitments, a little debate may take place here. A few days or even a week or so of debate may occur here; but when the decision is made the American people will say of the action of the Congress, the Executive, and the American Government, 'My Government has spoken, and we will wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support that decision.' "

I believe that that decision would be against an unwise and unnecessary war.

Oswald Garrison Villard

ARE WE TO RULE THE WORLD?

THE question whether we are to rule the world and make that the real objective of our interference in the imperialist war now going on is being squarely presented to the American people, notably by Henry C. Luce, who is today perhaps the most influential of all our magazine publishers. His pamphlet entitled *The American Century* has been endorsed by Dorothy Thompson again and again; she says she is not sure that this will not prove to be a historic piece of literature. In its essence it is a demand that America seize this opportunity when Europe is rapidly committing suicide to take the leadership of the world, to formulate its policies in what is left of this century, and to impose our will upon the globe.

Lest any reader think that this is an exaggeration, may I point out one fact which has been overlooked even by critics of Mr. Luce's extraordinary effusion? It is that he advocates not just freedom of the seas, but freedom of the seas "for ourselves and our friends." Could anything be more revealing? In 1917 Woodrow Wilson put us into war on behalf of freedom of the seas for everybody, for all the nations of the earth. The English did not like that, but they swallowed it with a mental reservation that Mr. Wilson would not get it, though they assured him they were all for it. At Versailles nothing further was heard of freedom of the seas.

But now this new historical American imperialism, born of the earth-shaking events in Europe and the sudden panic fear which has overtaken the descendants of Lexington, Valley Forge, Antietam and Gettysburg, is frankly determined if it wins this war—and it has no doubt of its impending victory—to make of the oceans of the world an American possession for the benefit of “ourselves and our friends.” As a veteran journalist writes to me after reading these words in Mr. Luce’s paper: “Shades of Theodore Roosevelt, Captain Mahan and John Hay! Did any of these, the first in his wildness, the second in his ignorance, the third in his cynicism, ever dare that? That’s not mere imperialism, it’s imperialism plus aggression. You would have to go to *Mein Kampf* for a parallel.”

Now let no one think that this proposal of Mr. Luce’s is just an impossible fantasy. We have now entered into partnership with Great Britain for better or for worse. We have joined hands with her to beat Hitler. This time we are going to be the senior partner in the enterprise—that is, if it goes on any length of time. For we are going to furnish the ships and the money and the munitions and the food and the hundred thousand articles which go toward outfitting the modern army, to say nothing of the tanks, the motor trucks, the tractors and the airplanes. If this war lasts two years England will be hopelessly in debt to us—even if we do not ask any money return. She will be in debt to us morally and actually may owe to us the very continuance of her free existence. Under those circumstances she will do what we tell her. If we decide after our victory that henceforth the world is to be ruled by the British and American fleets and that nobody else is going to be allowed to have a warship, why Mr. Luce’s desire will have been accomplished. The oceans of the world will be closed seas

to any who are not our friends—or our subjects—whenever we wish to close them.

Mr. Luce isn't the only man who has been toying with this idea of a dictated peace for the world. Hitler is determined to impose a *Pax Germanica* upon all of Europe and the Mediterranean countries, if not upon the whole world. On December 1, 1939, I talked with an important American ambassador in Europe who assured me that the Allies would have air superiority by March 1940, that that would end the war, that Stalin would then be ordered out of Poland and that the world would then be peaceful and serene, with a peace dictated by the British and French air forces, none other being allowed, world without end. Oh, yes! I forgot to add that before the peace was established three or four German cities were to be utterly destroyed down to the last house, so that the Germans would for once know what war on their own soil is like. With this act of justice completed we should have, he was certain, the benefits of a successful war to end war.

Frankly, that kind of world doesn't appeal to me. Nor does Mr. Luce's world ruled by a combination of English and American wisdom and statesmanship. Of course I know that we Americans and the English are the noblest people on earth. As a loyal American that has been dinned into me on every Fourth of July, in every election campaign, at every patriotic rally. Have we not always called this God's country? And have we not known that we were God's chosen people? Is not the complete proof of God's favor this glorious and fantastically rich country which He has turned over to us? Plainly, Mr. Luce has imbibed this belief and this philosophy of life. "We and our friends"—and today our friends are practically only the English—are to rule

the seas. But we, God's anointed, shall make this our century and our world.

Mr. Luce thinks the British people are worth risking our national existence to succor, but I am sure he knows in his heart that we Americans are much wiser and nobler and purer than the English. We shall save the British, but let it not be forgotten that this is to become "the American century." Of course there are some obstinate Englishmen who will be slow to admit this. Contemplating the glorious fight which they have put up against overwhelming Nazi forces, they are not unnaturally thinking very highly of themselves and their magnificent demonstration of the power of a spirit which has risen above unparalleled destruction, misery and wanton, wicked slaughter. But even before this war there were some Englishmen who were just as certain that they were the chosen people of the world as we have been sure that God has selected America for special, well deserved favors, or as Hitler is convinced that the Germans are the finest and greatest human beings ever seen, destined to control everything, with all the other inferior races as their servitors and slaves.

There is Lord Beaverbrook, for example, the British newspaper magnate, who is today saving Great Britain by the magnificent work he has been doing as the head of British production. Speaking a few years ago at a meeting held at Putney, as reported in the London *Daily Express*, in the course of a debate upon the customs union within the British empire, this great statesman said: "I absolutely assert that in advancing a policy of a customs union in the British empire we are doing God's work."

"When you say," asked an auditor, "that you are doing God's work, does God admit that one man is a foreigner and another is his brother?"

"Certainly," replied Lord Beaverbrook. "Why did God raise up the British empire? Why did God raise up the Israelites? Why has God maintained the British empire during the tempests and trials of centuries? Why has God made us the greatest, finest and most powerful people in the world?" (Loud applause.)

Of course the audience applauded. What patriotic audience would not? What patriotic audience anywhere would not expect to be told by every statesman and politician appearing before it that his auditors belonged to the greatest, finest and most powerful people in the world?

Well, again I stubbornly record my dissent. I do not think that this world was made to be ruled by Anglo-Saxons, by any two nations or any one nation. Of course I should prefer to be ruled by Americans or, next, by the British if one country is to dominate the world by sheer force. But it would be no time at all before the assumption of that power would destroy the country using it, morally, intellectually and finally physically. President Alan Valentine of the University of Rochester correctly observed, in testifying against the lend-lease bill, that the difference between a good dictator and a bad dictator was only a matter of time. He was right in thinking that the longer a despot rules the worse he gets. So with any country which might assume the domination of the world. Its very certainty in its own superiority, its being the chosen of God, will bring about its destruction. The megalomania of Hitler and his absurd belief that God created Germany to dominate the world will in time wreck his government even if he should win this war. If any world domination were attempted really in a spirit of moderation, of justice, and of the desire to rule fairly and equitably, it would inevitably deteriorate and fail. That is the unfailing lesson of all history.

As Daniel Webster put it in an admirable statement: "There are men in all ages who mean to exercise power usefully; but they mean to exercise it. They mean to govern well; but they mean to govern. They promise to be kind masters; but they mean to master. They think there need be but little restraint upon themselves." That is the historic story, and not only is it the right but it is the duty of Americans who would preserve their liberties and their institutions to continue to restrain their rulers. Otherwise the tremendous powers now exercised by the President will be unchecked and uncontrolled. When that comes to pass Americans will ask why they must fight even so abhorrent a dictator as Hitler if they have a dictator themselves. I know well the argument that we had a dictator in 1917-18 and yet the republic was restored. I reply there can be no comparison of what was going on in the world in those years with what is happening today. There were no dictators then, and the world is full of them at this hour and everyone in Washington declares that this country must become a dictatorship if we go to war to beat the dictators.

President Roosevelt will not object to this; indeed, the *New Republic* has already printed an article from its Washington Correspondent, "T. R. B.," an article announcing that President Roosevelt is no longer President of the United States but President of the World. Of course some benighted persons may dispute this claim. There could be no righteous dissent if this correspondent had called Mr. Roosevelt President of America and England, for that Mr. Roosevelt now is. He who pays the piper calls the tune. T. R. B. explained Mr. Roosevelt's March vacation in the Caribbean as being due not only to his natural and proper desire for a rest, but that he needed the quiet to adjust himself to the great new role that he must now play. A chapter has been ended. The

New Deal and the first two terms are well in the past. He is no longer to concern himself merely with the welfare of 130,000,000 people, but in the name of their safety to mold the progress of the world in the quest of security for democracy. Naturally he wants time to think a little bit about this trifling new task. He must set his thoughts in order; he must plan what the next steps are to be, how his world domination is to take shape.

So we shall continue to be deluged with appeals to go to war and, then, after winning it, to take over the management of this erring world. Already we are being told that it wasn't our fault that the Treaty of Versailles went wrong, or Mr. Wilson's. It was all the wickedness of the other participants in the making of the peace. They would not listen to our wisdom and give us our Fourteen Points. No, they took their own way, and now look what they've got! This time, plainly, the thing for us to do is not to ask anybody's cooperation in making the peace. We shall make it ourselves. We shall be the most powerful nation, militarily speaking, with by far the greatest armada the world has even seen, and we won't stand for any Lloyd George business at the making of this peace. We shall tell them all where they get off. God's country is on top and proposes to stay there. The William Allen White Committee will of course fall in line without a moment's hesitation. Did not Mr. White himself write as a callow youth (he has learned different now!): "It is the Anglo-Saxon's manifest destiny to go forth in the world as a world conqueror. He will take possession of all the islands of the sea. He will exterminate the peoples he cannot subjugate. That is what fate holds for the chosen people. It is so written. Those who would protest will find their objections overruled." There are practically Henry Luce's sentiments today.

So let us begin planning now to rule the world. Let us do away with the various self-constituted committees which are setting up a program for the world that is to be. Let us tell Mr. Streit to desist from planning his Anglo-Saxon union. If Adolf Hitler wins there will be no such union, and if we win our government will attend to that itself and dominate everything. What is left of England and the dominions will stand as loyal satellites. We may even have to take over India, but why not? If we are going to extend our rule over all the Pacific why should we not make over Asia?

And—heart-warming thought—how readily then we shall be able to eliminate the Bolsheviks! With the rest of the globe in our hands, we can simply and easily blockade them, shut them off from all contacts by mail, telephone, telegraph, radio, railroads and shipping. We shall make them live to themselves alone. What they cannot raise or create they will not be able to buy until they have reformed their ways and become as fine a democracy as we.

Indeed, the more I contemplate Mr. Luce's historic piece of literature the more certain I am that if we follow his lead this nation is going to have the time of its life. We shall raise our boys not only to be soldiers and sailors, but as great transoceanic bearers of our culture and religion to the outermost places of the world, as were the leaders of the legions of Rome when they conquered England and most of Europe. If that doesn't produce the millennium, why—but of course it will. God's chosen people cannot go wrong. They will produce a world that will make heaven seem shoddy indeed.

William Henry Chamberlin

DARE WE LOOK AHEAD?

I AM beginning to write this chapter on a dim blacked-out evening in Paris and on a date, September 3, 1939, which the future historian of the decline and fall of European civilization may well regard as decisive. For on this day the two largest remaining democratic and civilized countries of Western Europe decided to stake their democracy and their civilization on the second gigantic international conflict within a generation.

In a preceding chapter I explained why I consider this decision, although probably inevitable from considerations of prestige when it was taken, the product of an unwise policy, based on a miscalculation of forces and on a failure to realize the imperative necessity of making every effort to confine the war to the totalitarian states.

What is the outlook for our Western civilization, now that it has received the shock of a second great war, which is almost certain to achieve world proportions before it is ended, and which, because of the horribly perverted uses of science, gives every prospect of being more destructive than its predecessor? No one with the least sense of realism, it seems to me, would be inclined to give an optimistic answer. King Leopold of Belgium, in his appeal to the world on the eve of the war, gravely posed the question whether Europe is to commit suicide. And Premier Daladier ended his letter to Hitler with a prediction, only too likely to be

fulfilled, that in the event of a new Franco-German war "destruction and barbarism will be the surest victors."

Behind the fanfare of nationalist speeches and songs, the competition in propaganda, now so much more extensive and vivid because of the possibilities of the radio and all the other familiar accompaniments of the process of feeding millions of men to the Moloch of mass slaughter, one senses among thoughtful men on both sides of the front a deep uneasiness. How will it all end? Will any of the governments which began the war be in existence when it is ended? After a conflict that gives every promise of being long and bitter, will there not be some new form of brutal and destructive social revolution, wiping out what little civilization the war may have left?

The experience of the last war is both instructive and disconcerting. Every big positive change in political and social systems since 1914 has been for the worse. The victorious countries, Great Britain, France, and the United States, and the smaller neutral powers have gone on very much as one might have anticipated if there had been no war. There have been the same inventions and changes in social habits, the same alternations of prosperity and depression, the same experiments in social reform.

But the three great postwar revolutions (of which no one, I am convinced, would have occurred in its actual form had it not been for the influence of the war), communism, fascism, national socialism, are all, according to my own individualistic scheme of moral and humane and cultural values, overwhelmingly retrogressive in fundamental character. All are based on the complete denial of the rights of human personality, on the sacrifice of the individual to that swollen and deformed monster, the state. All preach and practice the damnable doctrine, which has probably caused more avoid-

able human suffering than any other single idea, that the end justifies the means. That the "end" itself for the two leading dictatorships, the Soviet Union and the Third Reich, has become pretty blurred is evident from their recent pact.

I think it is historically indisputable that all these movements stemmed from the World War. The Tsarist system in Russia was decadent. But the scope and the savagery of Lenin's social revolution reflected the bitterness, despair, and brutalization of a people that had been tormented beyond endurance by years of slaughter and defeat in a war against a technically superior enemy.

Italy was formally one of the victorious powers. But it was a poorer and weaker country than Great Britain and France. The war had placed a great strain on its social and economic system. It was cold-shouldered at the peace conference and given a scanty share of the spoils. All this helped to create the atmosphere of unrest and dissatisfaction which found expression in endless strikes, riots, and extremist demonstrations. And these in turn, since they did not lead up to any definite revolutionary climax, paved the way for the triumph of Fascism, a kind of middle-class bolshevism.

It is equally obvious that German National Socialism is profoundly rooted in the World War. The loss of the war, the cruelties and humiliations of the Treaty of Versailles, created a psychology of bitterness and revenge that found its ultimate expression in the Third Reich. It is true that Nazi propaganda has grossly exaggerated the iniquities of Versailles, and that a victorious Germany would have imposed a worse peace.

But it is also true that Germany was dealt with much more hardly than was France after the Napoleonic Wars that had kept the Continent in a turmoil for half a genera-

tion. The refusal to permit Austria to unite with Germany, the placing of three and a half million Germans, against their will, under Czech rule, the assignment to Italy of the solidly German South Tyrol were all violations of the principle of self-determination which was invariably invoked whenever it would work to Germany's disadvantage. The maintenance of the blockade against a half-starved people many months after the Armistice had been signed, and the taking away of milk cows from a country where many children were dying of malnutrition and many more were growing up with rickets, were naturally not forgotten so quickly in Germany as in the Allied countries.

But the worst feature of the Treaty of Versailles was its economic side, the demands that Germany should pay fantastic sums of money which could not conceivably be effectively transferred to the victorious states. These reparation demands—economically absurd, whatever may have been their moral justification—together with the equally unsound American demand for the repayment of war debts which the American high-tariff policy alone made it impossible to collect constituted a very important factor in the unprecedented economic crisis of 1929. And this crisis, as the German election figures show, was a main factor in giving Hitler his mass following, largely recruited from the ruined middle classes and from the unemployed.

The political and social changes of the nineteenth century were profoundly influenced by the French Revolution; and it seems only too probable that the similar changes in the twentieth century will be greatly influenced by the communist-fascist pattern. Here is certainly no cause for optimism about the age to which we must look forward.

One can find many surface similarities between the French Revolution and the upheavals which led to the establish-

ment of the modern dictatorships. To read Anatole France's *The Gods Are Athirst*, that incomparably lifelike novel of the French Revolution, is to see an accurate picture not only of the spirit but of many of the physical aspects of the Bolshevik regime in Russia in its early phase. There are many episodes of cruelty, fanaticism, and stupidity in the French Revolution that are quite comparable with the worst things that have occurred in Russia, Germany, and Italy.

But in its final effect on the human spirit, on the destiny of Europe, there is a significant contrast between the French Revolution and the three revolutions of our own time. The former, despite many paradoxes, failures, and inconsistencies, did in the long run make for the liberation of the individual human being. The "rights of man" were often observed in the breach during the changing regimes that succeeded one another so rapidly in France, but they were never forgotten.

The main permanent result of the Revolution—not only in France but also, through repercussion, in other European countries—was to sweep away the static privileged society of feudalism, to give free course to the individual. This led to many abuses and excesses. The Revolution in its later stages spawned a host of profiteers. Balzac, the conservative Catholic, who believed that democracy would lead to communism, has given us some unforgettably vivid and bitter portraits of the French new rich, who often, no doubt, compared unfavorably morally and intellectually with the aristocratic rulers of France before 1789.

But when one surveys the nineteenth century, the century of the influence of the French Revolution, as a whole, one cannot miss the fact that here was an epoch of mighty progress in human history. To this epoch of growing individualism belongs an extremely high proportion of achieve-

ment in all fields of human thought. In the multiplication of mechanical energy it exceeded the effort of all the preceding centuries from the beginning of time.

And it is difficult to conceive where we should be today in music, in literature, in philosophy, in history if the intellectual fruits of the last century were suddenly blotted out of our consciousness. Take Russia alone as an illustration. The Russian contribution to civilization before 1800 was negligible. By 1900 it had given the world immortal novelists, Turgenev, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky; great musicians, Mousorgsky, Tschaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov; scientists such as Mendeleev, Metchnikov and Pavlov; personalities like Kropotkin and Tolstoy and Herzen.

Of course development during this century was not a uniform upward march. Right was sometimes, although by no means always, on the scaffold. Wrong was often on the throne. The individualist or capitalist economic system that was replacing feudalism had its cruel and brittle sides. Popular well-being lagged behind the possibilities which were opened up by scientific discovery and technical application.

Yet, viewed in broad perspective, was there any European country that was not better off, on any reasonable standard of comparison, in 1900 than it had been in 1800? Among such standards one might suggest provision of public education, conditions of labor, humanization of penal codes, per capita consumption of food and manufactured goods, maintenance of public health. Who, in this early phase of Europe's second suicidal frenzy within a generation, could predict with confidence that in the year 2000 there could be a similar verdict of progress in relation to 1900?

I doubt whether there was any country in Europe at any

time during the nineteenth century where one could reasonably have said: "Civilization would be better off if we could restore things precisely as they were ten or twenty or fifty years ago." How sadly different is the situation today! With full appreciation of the injustices and the decadent aspects of Tsarism, I should have no hesitation in saying that one would have found in the Russia of 1909 more humanity, more individual personality, more creative thought, less avoidable suffering, less degraded living conditions than one would find in the Russia of 1939.

There was a nation-wide movement of protest before the war when an obscure Jew named Beilis was accused of committing ritual murder. (Incidentally, Beilis was acquitted.) There was not, there could not be a murmur of audible protest when large numbers of individuals, including some of the most famous leaders of the early period of the Revolution, were tried and put to death on accusations that were just as obviously absurd and fraudulent as the ritual murder indictment against Beilis.

If it lay within my power and I were given the alternative between an integral restoration of Tsarism, down to the last brass button on the uniform of the adjutant of His Imperial Majesty and the maintenance of Stalin's despotism, I would unhesitatingly choose the former alternative. Prewar Russia had its limited share in the civilization of Europe. Stalinite Russia, looming up so ominously as the possible winner of the present war, is unadulterated dark, barbarous Asia.

In the same way and for much the same reasons I should consider the slack easy-going Italy that Mussolini took over as a far more civilized and attractive community of human beings than Italy after seventeen years of Blackshirts and castor oil. And who can measure the gulf, in terms of popular well-being, cultural achievement, and standards of

humanity and common decency, between either the Imperial or the Republican regime in Germany and the semi-Bolshevik Third Reich?

The present war has followed so closely on the heels of its predecessor¹ that it should inspire no illusions in observers who can view it without wishful thinking and emotional partisanship. In the light of the plain facts of the last two decades, can anyone place faith in the Wilsonian phrases, now being furbished up for new use about war as an agency to end war, to create a better world, to make right and justice prevail? The fruit of the war to make the world safe for democracy was three of the most brutally antidemocratic revolutions in history. The sequel to the war to end war was an era of numerous minor wars and acts of international aggression, culminating in what is essentially a renewal of the World War, with far more terrible means of destruction available to the combatants.

I have no quarrel with antifascists when they paint a gloomy picture of what Europe will be if Nazi Germany wins the war. As a rationalist and an individualist I can scarcely conceive of anything more antipathetic to me personally than Hitler's dictatorship, except its equally brutal and less efficient quasi-ally, the Communist dictatorship in Russia.

Where I do take issue with the trend of official opinion in France and Great Britain and with a good deal of unofficial opinion in America is in refusing to believe that all will be for the best in a happy world if only Hitler is defeated. I was talking with one of my American interventionist friends

¹ One reason why the nineteenth century was one of progress was the absence of world-shaking universal wars between the end of the Napoleonic conflicts and the outbreak of the World War. A strong reason for believing that the present century will be one of retrogression is the outbreak of two major wars within the span of a generation.

in Paris shortly after the outbreak of the war. He was blithely predicting five or six years of sanguinary struggle, in which he wished America to supply a good deal of the cannon fodder. I suggested that civilization would not last so long.

"To hell with civilization!" he said. "We're going to beat Hitler."

With all due respect for my friend, a brilliant and well known figure in his field, I could not repress the thought: What a juvenile viewpoint! And how doubly juvenile in view of the recent experience with making the ex-Kaiser the source of all human ills! Is there any reason to believe that the downfall of Hitler will be any surer pledge of the future peace and security of the world than was the deposition of the Kaiser?

Hitler as an individual is negligible. In normal times he would have knocked about at odd jobs and attracted or bored small beerhall audiences with his half-baked "philosophy." He became formidable as a result of extremely complex forces. One of these is the secular eastward expansionism of the German race. A second is the uneven development of capitalism which left Germany, powerful in industrial technique, in the disciplined intelligence of its people, in soldierly spirit, without adequate sources of supply in raw materials. A third, perhaps most important, is the national instinct for revenge inspired by a peace treaty which was at once too harsh to bring about reconciliation and not harsh enough to eliminate Germany forever from the list of the great powers.

The peace treaty (if there is one) which will follow the present war will be written by men who may have seen their families blown to pieces in air raids. And this will also be true of the leaders of the inevitable movements for social

and economic change which will come in the wake of the war. Is it reasonable to expect that the peace treaties of the future will contain more elements of justice, mercy, and enlightened self-interest than that of Versailles, or that the new social patterns will be more humane than those of communism and fascism?

It is a pity that every responsible European statesman could not have been compelled to read and reread Thucydides' "History of the Peloponnesian War." For here, in a narrative at once spirited and admirably objective, one has the narrative of the long and terrible war in which there were no victors, and in which the end was the breakdown of Greek civilization. There are amazing parallels between Greece, divided into its small city-states, in the fifth century B.C. and the European continent today.

There was the rivalry between the great sea power, Athens, and the great land power, Sparta. There was the same game of power politics, the same series of intrigues and hostile alliances. One can find in Thucydides the same arguments for and against going to the aid of another state that interventionists and isolationists are using in America today. And the long war between the groups of Greek states, which was characterized by frequent betrayals and changes of front among the participants, was aggravated and complicated by savage civil conflicts within the belligerent states. It displayed all the familiar features of modern imperialism and of modern ideological fanaticism.

In the end Greek civilization proved unable to stand the strain of the struggle. Politically and culturally Greece entered a period of decadence. It was unable to resist the pressure first of Macedon, later of Rome. What a fateful and prophetic warning for Europe today! There are several prospective beneficiaries waiting like vultures around car-

tion to take advantage of Europe's war to an end that will certainly be bitter for all concerned. The most obvious of these beneficiaries are the half Asiatic and wholly barbarous Soviet Union, and Japan.

Perhaps the most disastrous and permanent result of the war will prove to be the westward expansion of the territorial possessions and influence of the Soviet Union, that implacable enemy of everything individualistic and humanistic in the European cultural tradition. Within a few weeks after the outbreak of hostilities some thirteen million unfortunate human beings—Poles, White Russians, and Ukrainians—had been brought under Stalin's rule, while the freedom of several little peasant democracies in the Baltic had been destroyed or gravely threatened.

The responsibility before history of the European statesmen who bid against each other for Soviet support is very heavy; it is like that of the Byzantine Greeks who, in their internal brawls, brought the Turks into Europe. Hitler, of course, is primarily responsible for this ominous penetration of the Soviet legions into the heart of Central Europe but France had already concluded a pact with the Soviet Union, which the latter, in its habitual tradition, betrayed at the first opportunity. And the Hitler-Stalin agreement of August 24 and its following agreements, with their renunciation of Germany's historic interests in the Baltic area, might never have been concluded if it had not been for the ill advised British and French overtures to Moscow in the spring and summer of 1939.

What a commentary on the decadence of democratic statesmanship that it was left to Stalin to recognize an axiomatic truth that Chamberlain and Daladier missed! This was that the countries which remained aloof from the war, or on its outer fringes, in the beginning stood the best

chance of being the final victors. Coolly, cunningly, foresightedly Stalin focused his whole tortuous policy on a single objective: the promotion of war between Germany, on one side, and Great Britain and France, on the other. And, to the lasting misfortune of our civilization, he succeeded.

Why could not Chamberlain and Daladier have realized that the sole hopeful chance of saving the democracy and individualism which they both cherished was to canalize Hitler eastward? Why did they not possess as much elementary statecraft as the Roman and Byzantine Emperors, who were always careful to keep the barbarians fighting among one another? Instead of this, by throwing themselves on the modern Goths, the Nazis, Great Britain and France merely played the game of the modern Sarmatians, the Soviet Communists, who will loom up as a fresh and formidable enemy if and when the Goths are disposed of.

Unquestionably the strongest factor that is now holding up the morale of the French and British peoples at the front and behind the lines is the belief that they are fighting for permanent peace. I know this from personal experience in France, from talks with soldiers at the front and with women and old men in Paris. And no doubt it is equally true in England.

I wish I could share this faith in a relatively simple and easy way out of the world's tragic impasse. I wish I could believe that the overthrow of Hitler would mark the beginning of a period of permanent peace and civilized living. If I could believe this my attitude toward the war would be entirely different. I might even reconcile myself, although with great difficulty, to the idea that America should enter the conflict.

But the probabilities seem to me to lie overwhelmingly

in a contrary direction. Specific prophecy is always dangerous. But what is the prospect that Great Britain and France will face if, after three years, to take the British estimate of the length of the war, they succeed in crushing Germany? Millions of men will have been killed and wounded. Thousands of ships will have been sunk. Scores of once beautiful cities and towns will have been visited by death and destruction from the air. But it will be a sword, not peace that the war-weary peoples will find at the end of this *Via Dolorosa*.

For Stalin, whose early acquisitions offer only a slight foretaste of his ultimate ambitions, will then be able to step in with a fresh army and all the poison gas of his propaganda. Contemptible and ineffective in normal times, this propaganda, as experience has shown, operates most powerfully on the masses when they have been driven almost to hysteria by the sufferings of war.

The original war objective, the defense and restoration of Poland, obviously cannot be realized unless the Soviet Union is also conquered. It will not be merely a question of the eastern provinces of Poland, which have already been seized, with the familiar Bolshevik accompaniment of killing large numbers of people marked out by culture, breeding, and religious faith. As soon as Germany breaks down, the Red Army will be in a position to seize the whole of Poland and much more in the Balkans besides.

Germany itself, to avoid another and sterner Versailles, may well go Communist; Hitler has already brought it a good part of the way. The specter of 1918 and 1919, when revolution and counterrevolution fought in Germany, would become a reality. Great Britain and France, already strained to the uttermost, would find themselves confronted by a hostile land mass stretching from the Rhine to the Pacific. And this time Russia would not be the broken, chaotic

country of 1918 and 1919, torn by civil war and quite unable to act outside its own frontiers.

No, all the omens are decidedly against any simple "happy ending" of the present war. Europe is faced with the prospect of an indefinite cycle of wars and revolutions, each perhaps more senseless than the one which preceded it, each dragging civilization to a lower level. The fatal vicious circle is already clear for anyone with eyes to see. The World War spawned communism and fascism. Fascism and communism, in their turn, brought on the Second World War.

It was perhaps the insight of the former teacher of history, Edouard Daladier, that inspired the prediction, voiced in his letter to Hitler, that barbarism and destruction would be the surest victors in a new war. What a tragic irony that Premier Daladier should have felt obliged to call his countrymen to give their lives, with such a gloomy prospect at the end!

During the World War there were two possibilities that might have afforded some hope that the lives laid down in such scenes of carnage as Verdun and the Somme might not have been sacrificed in vain. There was the hope, voiced by Wilson, of a community of nations which might lay the basis of a new world order, without hostile alliances and balance-of-power politics, where war could be eliminated. It was a noble idea, but the history of the last two decades has been the record of its complete frustration. The impotence to which the League of Nations had fallen was eloquently reflected in the fact that, when the war actually broke out, no one troubled to ask what the League thought about it.

One may dispute as to the causes of the failure of this experiment in international co-operation. One may blame American abstention, or the character of the Versailles Treaty, or French unwillingness to trust Germany, or Ger-

man untrustworthiness, or Italian and Japanese violence. The fundamental causes, I think, lie deeper. They are linked up with the general decline of European civilization which I shall discuss later. But the failure is there, complete and absolute.

The other ideal which, during the World War, might have seemed to hold out some prospect of a pacific, civilized world order was that of socialism. As some people found an immediate devil, responsible for the World War, in the Kaiser, others found it in the capitalist system. By putting together some of the facts about imperialism, the struggle for markets, the profits of munition makers it was easy to construct a theory that capitalism, the system of production for private profit, was responsible for war. Destroy capitalism, and war would cease.

It seemed as simple as this to Lenin, who may dispute with Hitler the right to be considered the greatest revolutionary of our age. Because he and his associates (honest men, with a few unimportant exceptions; the breed of Stalinite robots had not yet appeared) believed with consuming passion that the capitalist system was responsible for the unprecedented slaughter of the World War, the cruelties of their own anticapitalist revolution were transfigured and justified in their eyes.

But the whole record of the Soviet Union—its attempt to conquer Poland in 1920, its more successful effort to share the spoils of that unfortunate country with Hitler in 1939, its unprovoked invasion of Finland, its bloodless conquest, in the best Hitler technique, of the Baltic States, its smashing of independent Georgia, its subjugation of Outer Mongolia, to mention only a few cases—completely refutes the idea that a socialist economic order is any guaranty against an aggressive foreign policy. Indeed it is just in those coun-

tries where "capitalism," or economic individualism, enjoys freest play that sentiment for peace proved strongest in the years which immediately preceded the outbreak of the Second World War.

Every attempt to realize the socialist ideal has proved a failure. In Russia, where the experiment went furthest, the failure has been a catastrophe. Its most conspicuous achievements have been two great famines, the creation of a vast system of serf labor under subhuman living conditions, the establishment of a regime of systematic terrorism unmatched either under Tsarism or under the fascist states, and the final evolution of a revolutionary dictatorship into an irresponsible personal despotism, quite devoid of any ideological basis.

One finds far more economic elements of socialism in Nazi Germany and in Fascist Italy than in democratic countries. But these forms of what might well be called bastard socialism have proved the most effective means of preparing peoples, economically as well as spiritually, for a constant state of war-in-peace which easily advances into actual war.

There still remains the progressive democratic type of socialism, represented by the British Labor party and by the Socialist parties of France and some of the smaller European countries; but, except perhaps in Scandinavia, this type of socialism has not proved very creative. It has been handicapped by the feud with the Communists and with smaller dissident groups. It has not developed sufficient strength either to stop war or to exercise a decisive influence on peace settlements. And this type of moderate, pacific socialism went down completely before the gangster onslaughts of Russian Communists, Italian Fascists, and German Nazis.

This is an age of cynical nihilism, of frustration of all

ideals. The two strongest new postwar ideologies were communism and fascism; and each of these betrayed its own professed principles, in the name of which so much blood had been shed, when Moscow and Berlin concluded their deal at the expense of Poland. In the light of this new unholy alliance Hitlerism and Stalinism stand exposed as completely opportunist dictatorships, animated only by lust for power and plunder and dissociated from any social or economic ideas, even perverted and mistaken ones. The Communist and Nazi regimes now appear as devoid of any coherent consistent body of principles as the predatory Goths and Vandals, with whom, indeed, they possess disconcertingly many traits in common.

What a dismal series of triumphs of fanaticism, ignorance, and brutality over reason, culture, and humanity Europe has witnessed during the last two decades! What an irony it lends to the last sentence of the autobiography of Henry Adams, who lived in what seems in retrospect such a safe, sheltered, civilized epoch of world history:

"Perhaps some day—say 1938, their centenary²—they might be allowed to return together for a holiday, to see the mistakes of their own lives made clear in the light of the mistakes of their successors; and perhaps then, for the first time since man began his education among the carnivores, they would find a world that sensitive and timid natures could regard without a shudder."

1938. Without a shudder. Japanese airplanes bombing from one end of China to the other, Spain in the last throes of savage civil war. Nazis overrunning two small civilized states. The endless martyrdom of German Jews and of the Russians of all classes who fall under Stalin's displeasure.

² Adams was imagining the return to earth of himself and of two old friends, who had also been born in 1838.

The Holy Land of three religions torn with the feud of Arab and Jew. . . .

It is high time, I think, to put aside hopeful illusions. European civilization is in an unmistakable process of deterioration and decay, symbolized in an ever growing cult of violence in the settlement of international and internal disputes, a violence that becomes more and more unmotivated. Far from arresting this trend, the present war can only greatly accelerate it. Nothing brings a democratic country so swiftly to dictatorial conditions as the existence of a state of war. It is not only the street lamps that are dimmed in the democratic capitals.

Censorship, suspension of normal freedom of discussion, installation of industrial and financial controls very similar to those of the totalitarian states—these things are much easier to introduce and to perfect than to withdraw. It is safe to predict that such limited right of criticism as still exists (more in England than in France) will disappear as the war becomes fiercer and more pitiless.

If one takes the long view, the only correct perspective from which to view major historical developments, one is struck by the similarities between the Europe of today and the Greece of Thucydides. And the judgment which history has passed on Greece will also probably apply to Europe. No one cares now about the Blue Books, White Books, Yellow Books, and other apologia which Athens and Sparta may have issued to prove themselves in the right. No one worries overmuch as to who was the aggressor at Potidaea or whether the commons or the nobles at Corcyra had the better legal case. What is important is that a great civilization tore itself to pieces in a long agony of war and revolution. It is in such an agony, with only short deceptive respites, that Europe has been since 1914. And during that

period of twenty years there has been no creative saving idea in thought, in politics, in economics. The great changes have all been for the worse.

Another period with which Europe's condition suggests comparison is the fifth century after Christ, when the decline of the Roman Empire culminated in its fall. There is no greater mistake than to imagine that the curve of human development is always in an upward direction. Think of the contrast between the intellectual circle of Cicero or Seneca and the court of some Merovingian king of the sixth or seventh century where the monarch could not write his own name. Or compare Athens at the time of Plato and Athens under Turkish rule, or Rome in the age of Marcus Aurelius and the medieval Rome of brawling, stabbing gangsters.

Gibbon, himself the product of a period that believed in progress and enlightenment, after describing the barbarian conquest of the decaying empire, put the question whether Europe was still exposed to such invasions. He reassured himself with a negative answer on the ground that barbarians could not conquer Europe without first becoming civilized themselves. But one fears that the great historian overlooked the possible emergence of a species that is very much alive and rampant at the present time: the anthropoid ape mounted on a tank or armed with a machine gun.

Europe now seems destined for a long series of wars and revolutions. It can scarcely be imagined that it can retain its former place in world affairs after such a suicidal ordeal. There has been, after all, something artificial in Europe's predominant position on the world stage. It has rested on a superiority in military and industrial technique which is not necessarily eternal, especially if the European continent is periodically torn with devastating wars and their retro-

gressive consequences in everything from man power to economics. It is the intangible element of prestige, as much as actual physical power, that accounts for the privileged position of the European in many Asiatic and African colonies and semi-colonies. And nothing is so destructive of prestige as a prolonged and difficult war.

War is a tremendous accelerator of violent and subversive processes. One must reckon to the account of the first World War not only three major revolutions in Europe but a vast ferment of unrest among yellow and brown and black men from China to Morocco.

In the Orient the legend of white superiority, shaken by the Japanese victory over Russia in 1904-1905, was very largely destroyed by two immediate results of the World War. One of these was the breach in the previous white solidarity, the hounding of the Germans out of China, the taking away of their extraterritorial rights. The other was the appearance in Manchuria, China, and Japan of tens of thousands of penniless Russian refugees, the men sometimes begging or performing menial work such as white men had never performed in the East, the women sometimes becoming concubines of the Chinese.

All this had its effect in stimulating the anti-Western Chinese revolutionary movement of 1925-1927. This was checked by two extraneous developments: the cleavage between conservative and communist elements among the Chinese revolutionaries and the Asiatic civil war between Japan and China which began in 1937. But an accommodation between Japan and China, on the basis of driving the white man from the Orient, is not outside the bounds of possibility; and one wonders whether the stability of the great British, French, and Dutch colonial empires can be assured in the event of a prolonged war, even regardless of

its issue. What, for instance, would become of the vast Dutch East Indies if Germany should march into the Netherlands? The Japanese Navy probably has some ideas on this subject.

At the very least, much that gave support and character to the individualistic civilization of Europe seems certain to disappear under the impact of war. The British national debt increased roughly tenfold during the World War. Can it stand another gigantic increase without financial collapse, with its accompaniments of inflation and repudiation and all the grave social consequences which these would entail? The French franc, worth twenty cents in gold before the first World War, is now worth a little over two cents in terms of the present devalued American dollar. What will it be worth after the end of the present war?

The belligerent nations must reckon with cruel losses, economic as well as human, in the form of lost markets, bankrupt investments, destroyed shipping and property. The range of possible destruction is widened by the development of aircraft. And no one, I imagine, after the experiences of "reparations" after the last conflict, would be foolish enough to believe that the vanquished can be effectively forced to repay these losses. The final and permanent victory will be that of the graveyard and the desert, of hunger, pestilence, and social chaos.

I return again to what seems to me the amazing shortsightedness of feeling that nothing matters except beating "Hitlerism." "Hitlerism" is only one aspect, perhaps not the most important aspect of the general disease that has overtaken European civilization. If there were only three countries in the world, Germany, Great Britain, and France, the two latter might set out to crush a restlessly expansion-

ist regime in Germany with some reasonable hope that this would mean permanent peace.

But the actual situation is infinitely more complicated. Shortly after I arrived in Paris, in the spring of 1939, I delivered a talk at an American club in which I predicted that the Soviet Union and Japan would be the only prospective victors in a European war. I see no reason to alter this prediction, now that the war has begun.

Apart from the Communist challenge in Europe and the Japanese challenge in Asia, the Western powers, bled white after a war which gives no prospect of being short and easy, will be faced with other problems, social unrest at home, intensified nationalist strivings in their colonies.

I am sometimes surprised at the reaction which these pessimistic perspectives arouse in Americans to whom I talk. There is a confused feeling that America should "do something about it," perhaps in the best style of the crusade of 1917, designed to make the world safe for democracy to the tune of "Over There." My own conclusions as to America's proper role are entirely different. It seems to me that any statesman who would directly or indirectly work for American involvement in what is not a single war but simply an episode in a long series of wars and revolutions would incur a crushing responsibility before history and before his own conscience. The spectacle of a great civilization in decline must arouse our deepest grief; but there is nothing we can effectively do to avert it.

America does not possess the infinite power or the infinite wisdom that are supposed to be the attributes of Almighty Providence. It is first of all beyond our physical power, unless we propose to out-Hitler Hitler in militarization, with all the disastrous consequences which this would entail for our democratic ideal, to put every obstreperous

nation in Europe and Asia into what we regard as its proper place. And, even apart from this very important consideration, America seems to me singularly ill adapted for the role of world judge and arbiter.

Because we are a young people our judgments are likely to be intolerant and impatient, naïve and half-baked. We are clay in the hands of a skillful propagandist from one of the older lands of Europe with designs on our men and our money. We succumb far too easily to thinking of complicated world developments in oversimplified terms of "menaces" against which we must go out and fight. This is one side of our character. There is another and more hopeful side. There is a solid bedrock of common sense that has kept some of our adventurous amateur diplomats and statesmen from plunging us too deeply into the quarrels of Europe and Asia. Just because he is not an expert on the precise state of Chinese and Japanese rights in Manchuria before 1931 or on the ethnological frontiers between Germans, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Ruthenes, and Magyars the average American has a sound instinct to leave these matters alone. No matter how much propaganda may be brought to bear on him, he knows that America's frontiers are the Atlantic and the Pacific, not the Rhine or the Vistula or the Yangtze.

It may prove to have been wishful thinking, but I do not believe there is anything fatalistically preordained about American entrance in the present war. Our national destiny, properly conceived, would be to keep our own hemisphere free from aggressive foreign penetration (a big enough job even for an ambitious people), to work out our own great problem of insuring that mechanical progress will mean work and a steadily rising standard of living for all, to take the lead in the relief enterprises that will be only too necessary throughout Europe's ordeal. The argument is

sometimes used that American economy will be so much affected by the war that participation will become ultimately inevitable. This seems to me open to the obvious retort that whatever losses may be incurred by staying out of war will be negligible, compared with those which will be entailed by going in. Moreover, the costs of remaining aloof would be only material. The costs of entering war would have to be measured in human lives and in greatly increased liability to reactionary modifications of our democratic and individualistic system.

Where did Europe miss its way? What were the causes of the decline in our century after the progress of the last? What was the fatal moment when the ascending phase of the glorious civilization of the nineteenth century ceased? The fact of the decline is easier to establish than its causes.

Suppose it were possible, by some magical effort of human will, to restore the world precisely as it was in 1913. Is there anyone, except possibly the jobholders of the communist and fascist regimes, who would not see in this prospect an infinite blessing, who would not gladly sacrifice the inventions and comforts and luxuries of the last two and a half decades for the sake of a world that had been spared two major wars and innumerable minor ones, three destructive revolutions, accompanied by unprecedented tyranny over the human mind and barbarous maltreatment of class, race, and political minorities? Who would not be glad to ride in an old-fashioned automobile, if only the tank had not been invented? Who would not find trains fast enough as means of conveyance, if only the danger of airplanes dropping their explosive and incendiary bombs could be forever banished?

The date of the beginning of the decline of European civilization can easily be set. It is August 1, 1914. Much more difficult and complex is the task of analyzing its causes.

Even the great Gibbon, in his marvelous narrative of the decline and fall of Imperial Rome, nowhere gives a clear-cut explanation of the main causes of this tremendous event. If it is obviously not easy to extract from old chroniclers the deeper reasons of the occurrences which they describe, it is perhaps still less easy to analyze with any assurance a catastrophe that is taking place before one's eyes. A short perspective is always apt to be blurred and distorted.

Sometime, perhaps, I shall be able to devote years of study and research to the task, at once gloomy and fascinating, of trying to interpret Europe's decline. Now I will only attempt to suggest, very tentatively, a few of its more obvious causes.

Europe's greatest weakness has been its failure to realize its essential unity. There is something grotesque, anomalous, impossible, in such a limited geographical area, in the existence of so many states, large and small, bristling with bellicose nationalism, political and economic, especially in the face of such large natural units as the United States, the Soviet Union, the British Empire and perhaps the great Asiatic empire which Japan is building up. Europe maintained the politics of the eighteenth century when the whole trend of twentieth century economics and industrial technique called for greater union and interdependence.

The European forces that should have made for peace, the many international associations, political, cultural, scientific, that stretched across frontier lines were too weak to counteract the dark forces that made for ultimate catastrophe, pathological nationalism, competition in armaments, power politics, expressed in hostile alliances, diplomacy that worked in the dark. There was a most lamentable and shortsighted failure on the part of the ruling classes in all countries to realize that overhead costs of modern totali-

tarian war are so great that, while there may be vanquished, there can be no victors. The penalty of defeat is revolution.

There was a striking and ominous chasm between the material progress which was made possible by scientific discovery and invention and the moral and cultural development of the human race. The same impersonal amoral physical science has made possible the elimination of epidemics and the prodigious destruction of air bombing.

There was something ephemeral and brittle as well as brilliant about the new industrial era. It did not strike the solid roots of the feudal system. With its alternations of boom and slump, its rapid changes of fortune, it imparted to human existence a more artificial, more hectic, less stable character. The prosperity of the nineteenth century was largely bound up with the tapping of new markets, the opening up of new frontiers. As these sources of stimulus disappeared new problems, for which no adequate solution has yet been found, arose in connection with the distribution of goods. Europe's privileged position during the nineteenth century was largely based on a supremacy in industrial technique which, in the nature of things, was certain to be challenged as former markets for manufactured goods became industrialized.

A very important cause of friction, which has become especially marked during the last decade, was the unequal development of capitalism. This, in turn, may be attributed partly to differences in the natural wealth of various countries, partly to the disadvantages faced by certain countries which achieved national unity or world contacts later than others. It is not the result of accident or of a peculiarly heavy dose of original sin that three countries which arrived late on the imperialist stage, Germany, Italy, and Japan, have shown themselves restlessly aggressive.

These have-not powers have exaggerated their grievances for propagandist effect. The remedy which they have sought, violent conquest, is open to moral objections, is of doubtful economic expediency, and threatens in the long run to bring them into conflicts which threaten their national existence. But the handicaps of a numerous energetic people, living in a relatively constricted area and poor in markets and sources of raw material under its own sovereignty, are genuine. And this is especially true in the postwar age, with its numerous restrictions on the free moments of immigrants, goods, and capital. One restriction breeds another, and the stresses and strains in the edifice of international trade and investment became progressively more severe.

At first the modern industrial system favored individualism and democracy. But with its development came impersonal collectivist tendencies. The simplest most workable form of democracy, which one can see in a very fine form in Switzerland today, is that of a community of small owners, farmers, handicraftsmen, small business men, where there are no serious lines of class cleavage and no striking differences of wealth.

With the growth of millionaires at one end of the social scale and slums at the other, with the springing up of big combinations of capital and their natural counterpart, powerful labor organizations, the individual tends to become squeezed between pressure groups. Individual liberty is threatened, and the preservation of democracy becomes a much more complex and difficult affair; and, as the experience of the last two decades shows, democracy becomes increasingly vulnerable to attack not from old-fashioned conservatism, very much weakened as a political and social force, but from such demagogic perversions of the democratic idea as communism and fascism.

Europe's time of grace, I suspect, was before 1914. The World War let loose so many germs of hatred, folly, wrong, and injustice that there was no time to recover from it before its successor was already upon the stricken Continent. There was no real peace after the great catastrophe of 1914-1918, only an uncertain truce. Mutual hatred and suspicion made the task of creating a new international order almost hopeless from the beginning.

In retrospect I think the unsuccessful peacemakers of Versailles committed two capital blunders, among many minor mistakes. The first was to create an embittered proletarian "nothing to lose" psychology, the psychological prelude to the desperate adventurism of the Third Reich, in Germany by the confiscation of so much German private property and by the fantastically unworkable reparations arrangements. The second was in failing to smash the Soviet system in Russia, that declared enemy of individualist civilization, while it was still weak. This could easily have been done if the anti-Bolshevik leaders had been helped as energetically and efficiently as Franco was helped in Spain. But when a process of decline is in full course it is perhaps useless to dwell on isolated mistakes and "might-have-beens."

One more point should be noted among the many danger signals for individual liberty. The progress of science has served tyranny well in creating the modern weapons that give large industrially advanced states such a cruel advantage in wars against weaker neighbors. A generation ago it would have taken Italy many years to conquer Abyssinia and months, if not years, to occupy Albania. Without aviation Japan's range of destruction in China would have been limited. It was only because of its tanks and airplanes that Germany could overrun Poland in three weeks.

Some of the noblest pages in history, describing the re-

sistance of small peoples to powerful invaders, could never have been written if air and mechanized weapons had existed throughout all time. These weapons are a double menace to liberty. They make it appallingly easy for the large state to crush its smaller neighbor. They also make it possible for a ruling clique in a dictatorship to dispose very quickly and efficiently of any movement of popular revolt.

Is there any hope for Europe's future? I am afraid the omens almost all point to the twentieth century as an age of retrogression, of decline to constantly lower levels, culturally and materially, through a more and more disorderly and senseless series of wars and revolutions. But the medieval legend on which Wagner based his opera "Tannhäuser" tells of a withered staff that put forth fresh blossoms after the Pope had cursed the repentant Tannhäuser and declared that redemption was no more possible than the blossoming of his own staff.

Should such a miracle occur, should the glorious civilization of the old Continent, almost extinguished in some of its largest countries and gravely threatened everywhere, experience a renaissance I can conceive only one form which this could assume. There must be a new universal consciousness of the sacred value of individual personality, so terribly obliterated in war and in the serf states which the last war produced. The revolutions which grew out of the World War were all pointed in the wrong direction, increasing the power of that unholy monster, the state, to grotesque proportions.

There is a chance—a very faint chance, I am afraid—that the revolutions, violent or peaceful, which must follow the new war will be of a different character, individualist rather than collectivist. There is just the shadow of a possibility that the plain people everywhere will rebel at last against

the sanguinary game of which they are always the victims, that they will set up a new order in which would-be dictators will be shot at sight and conscription and balance-of-power politics and competitive armaments and all the other toys with which politicians and diplomats and generals like to play until they go off in the ultimately inevitable explosion will be banished forever. It is only on this basis of a free United States of Europe, the product of free men firmly and implacably resolved never again to be misled into the dark and bloody insanity of war and prepared to make the infinitely lesser sacrifices which permanent peace would require, that the present century in Europe may be an epoch not of servitude and barbarism, but of freedom and rebirth.

Anne Morrow Lindbergh

THE WAVE OF THE FUTURE
A Confession of Faith

CENTURIES ago, in an age not unlike our own, when the established world was cracking, a long period of peace was coming to an end, and a dream of civilized order and unity was dying, Boethius, a Roman philosopher and scholar, sat at his desk and contemplated his changing world with a troubled and uneasy mind. He wrote a poem, full of the questions that were besieging him. How can this truth be reconciled to that truth? this right to that right? How can all these conflicting facts be adjusted in one man's thought? Near the end of the poem, as a desperate acknowledgment of the dilemma, though not a solution, come these lines:

"And therefore whoso seeks the truth
Shall find in no wise peace of heart."

When I first read those words, a few months ago, I had that supreme thrill, across the centuries, of feeling in sympathy with the mind of another human being, far from me in time, language, race. For an instant the gulfs were swept away; I knew what that man felt.

I have myself been the victim of corroding uneasiness, doubt, and fear these past years. What thinking person can survey the world tragedies today without crying out in torture of mind, "But *why* has this come? And what should one do about it?"

I give this personal confession only in the hope that it may help to clear the minds of others in doubt and confusion—others who, like myself, are not specialists in history, economics, or foreign affairs, but who feel that the issues confronting us today are the concern of the average citizen even more than of the expert.

I do not urge my point of view upon you; nor do I offer any concrete solution. There are enough people in the world already offering solutions. Some of these people are high-minded idealists; some are politicians, sincere or otherwise; some are skillful propagandists. But, however much they may differ, they are all convinced they have the answer. I do not think the issues are as crystal clear as they would have us believe.

A critic once complained to Chekhov that he had given no solution to the problem in his story. Chekhov wrote back, with rare modesty for an author, that the duty of the writer was not to solve the problem but to attempt to state it correctly. It is in such a spirit that I write. My point of view, in juxtaposition with the opposing points of view of others, may help the reader to find his own solution, or to strengthen his own conviction, even if it differs from mine.

I offer, then, not a solution but a record of my attempt to reconcile the many conflicting points of view which have assailed me in travels abroad and at home during the last troubled years. Perhaps it would be better called a confession of faith. A faith—though it may spring from long periods of thought and analysis—is not seen, but felt; not proved, but believed; not a program, but a dream.

In recent years, my generation has seen the beliefs, the formulas, and the creeds, that we were brought up to trust implicitly, one by one thrown in danger, if not actually discarded: the sacredness of property, the infallibility of the

democratic way of life, the efficiency of the capitalistic system—to mention only a few of the better known household gods which seem to be threatened or dislodged from their sacrosanct niches. Even such fundamental concepts as the goodness of God, the equality of man, and the Christian ethical code are rudely swept away in many parts of the world today.

So what are we to stand on? What are we to teach our children? How fantastic a world in which one gasps in the morning papers at the invasion of Holland and Belgium by tanks, machine guns, and bombers, and in the same breath tells one's children not to use the front entrance of the house in case the slamming of the screen door frighten a mother robin nesting in the cornice above! How shall we explain these things and how deal with them?

It is quite clear, answer my Pro-Ally friends. The world in which we were brought up—the good, the Christian, the Democratic, the capitalistic world—is in danger of toppling, and we are fighting to save it. It is, as you must see, purely and simply a case of a crusade against evil. The Forces of Good are fighting the Forces of Evil, and we are on the side of the Forces of Good.

What answer is there to these sincere and fine people? For I am not now talking of propagandists. I am speaking here of sincere, honest, high-minded men and women, whose judgment I respect, whose motives are spotless, whose lives are blameless, whose fundamental ideals and beliefs I also cherish and try to follow. What answer can one give to these friends, except that they are right, and therefore we should be in the war against evil?

My answer is that they *are* right, but only right relative to the small stage at which they are looking, only relative to that beautiful, perfect, safe panorama seen by us from

the narrow fan-like angle of our front-row plush seats; not right relative to the whole three-dimensional landscape.

These Forces of Evil, persecution, aggression, war, and theft *are* sins, and I stand against them. But there are other sins, such as blindness, selfishness, irresponsibility, smugness, lethargy, and resistance to change—sins which we “Democracies,” all of us, are guilty of. And there is no sin punished more implacably by nature than the sin of resistance to change. For change is the very essence of living matter. To resist change is to sin against life itself.

The moral case of the “Democracies” (I include America also) seems to me to find its equivalent in the Bible story of the rich young man. You remember he was an attractive, fine young man. He followed the rules and the ethics of the Old Testament. And we are told that Christ loved him. He was no sinner; he was a good man—as we “Democracies” are good nations.

To the questions of Christ on his way of life, he replied that he had followed the Commandments. But Christ, not yet satisfied, answered, “Sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor.”

And the young man “went away grieved: for he had great possessions.”

I am not here speaking literally, although a very good case can be, and has been, built up for the “Have-not Nations” deserving more share in the possessions of the world, largely in the hands of the “Have Nations.” Many of the most intelligent minds in the United States, England, and France, years before the war, argued this case courageously and well. Perhaps had they been listened to earlier, there would have been no Naziism and no war.

I do not believe that this case, right as it may be, excuses the methods of aggression and war; but it does, to

some degree, explain them. Frustration and privation *explain* theft; they do not *excuse* it. However, I am not now arguing on so literal or particular a plane. What I am trying to analyze is something far more profound and fundamental than national rights and wrongs.

I am trying to answer my own question: "Why has this come?" And I am trying to find a deeper and truer answer than the superficial and facile one: "It has come because the German people are innately evil, and are led by a few individuals who happen to be a scourge of mankind." But evil does not seem to me to spring without reason in a pure and blameless world; nor scourges rise without some cause. It is this cause I want to fathom.

It is not enough to say, "Pure accident—pure evil—pure greed." Nor am I satisfied by the sheer materialistic totalitarian answer: "Need for expansion—unjust division of spoils—our turn for conquest and rule—might makes right." One set of arguments seems to me as inadequate as the other. Neither fully explains the present war, nor the last war, nor the Russian Revolution, nor the rise of Fascism. Both arguments seem to me based on a superficial plane; both ignore fundamental forces and causes.

What was pushing behind Communism? What behind Fascism in Italy? What behind Naziism? Is it nothing but a "return to barbarism," to be crushed at all costs by a "crusade"? Or is some new, and perhaps even ultimately good, conception of humanity trying to come to birth, often through evil and horrible forms and abortive attempts?

What will the historian, looking back on us from the distant future, think of these movements? Will he not class them all together, possibly, as expressions of a common movement in the history of mankind—a movement perhaps, in some measure, caused by our great material advance at

the expense of our moral and spiritual one; by our faulty attempts to digest, absorb, and use for the benefit of more of mankind than hitherto, our scientific accumulations and discoveries? From this ultimate point of view, the war might be only an expression of one of those great mutations in history.

Something, one feels, is pushing up through the crust of custom. One does not know what—some new conception of humanity and its place on the earth. I believe that it is, in its essence, good; but because we are blind we cannot see it, and because we are slow to change, it must force its way through the heavy crust violently—in eruptions. Some of these eruptions take unrecognizable forms. "Great ideas enter into reality with evil associates and with disgusting alliances. But the greatness remains, nerving the race in its slow ascent."

No, I cannot see the war as a "crusade." If I could label it at all, I would label it part of a vast revolution. I am not defending the forms this revolution has taken; aggression, terror, class or race persecution. I oppose these as deeply as any American. But I do feel that had the world been able, by peaceful revolution, to foresee and forestall the changes, to correct the abuses that pushed behind the Communist and Fascist revolutions, we would not now have to come to them by such terrible means. The world has been forced to its knees. Unhappily, we seldom find our way there without being beaten to it by suffering.

I cannot see this war, then, simply and purely as a struggle between the "Forces of Good" and the "Forces of Evil." If I could simplify it into a phrase at all, it would seem truer to say that the "Forces of the Past" are fighting against the "Forces of the Future." The tragedy is that there is so

much that is good in the "Forces of the Past," and so much that is evil in the "Forces of the Future."

To make this statement is not to say that "might makes right," or that it is Germany's "turn to win," or to give any such literal and facile explanations. It is not to claim that the things we dislike in Naziism *are* the forces of the future. But it is to say that somehow the leaders in Germany, Italy and Russia have discovered how to use new social and economic forces; very often they have used them badly, but nevertheless, they have recognized and used them. They have sensed the changes and they have exploited them. They have felt the wave of the future and they have leapt upon it. The evils we deplore in these systems are not in themselves the future; they are scum on the wave of the future.

This has happened before. Consider the leaders of the French Revolution. No one today defends their atrocities; but few seriously question the fundamental necessity or "rightness" of the movement. Yet had we been living then, I am sure the majority of us would have been profoundly shocked—so shocked that we would not have been able to see beyond our emotions to the necessity that lay beneath.

The forces of evil are sweeping out the forces of good, is the tenor of Burke's denunciation of the Revolution. What hope is there for the world, he pleads, in the face of such "frauds, impostures, violences, rapines, murders, confiscations . . . and every description of tyranny and cruelty"? And as I read his beautiful words now, in defense of the falling aristocratic rule of life, I, myself, am moved to his point of view, even as we are all of us moved today by equally stirring pleas in the columns of our magazines and daily newspapers.

For who does not feel like this today, at least emotion-

ally? Who does not feel, the world I love is going down, and all the things in it that I cherish? No matter how the arguments may sound to one's mind, there remains the plain fact, in one's heart, that most of us prefer the old world of England, France, and the United States to the new world of Fascist Europe. I feel this way myself. I may be completely prejudiced and conditioned by the life I have led. I have lived in both France and England, as well as America; and it is their way of thinking, living, speaking, and acting that I prefer; their codes and their laws, I respect. They were not perfect, perhaps, but they made possible a mode of life I shall look back to the rest of my days with nostalgia.

What I question is the confident assumption that this way of life—in which I include our own here in the United States—will still be there after the war is over, even if Great Britain wins; or that it would have continued for long, unchanged, had there been no war. A world in which there were widespread depressions, millions of unemployed, and drifting populations was not going to continue indefinitely. A world in which young people, willing to work, could not afford a home and family, in which the race declined in hardiness, in which one found on every side dissatisfaction, maladjustment and moral decay—that world was ripe for change. That it had to die in violence is the catastrophe; that it had to die in misery, terror and chaos; that it had to fall, dragging down with it much that was good and beautiful and right, spilling the blood, wasting the lives, warping the spirit of many who were needed for the reconstruction of the new world; that it had to die in war, which carries in its train those very miseries it seeks to escape.

I always hoped war could be avoided, or that an early

peace would still save some part of a world I loved—that the good of a dying civilization could be bequeathed in comparative tranquillity to the new one; as, in nature, a flower dies, but the plant puts forth a new bud from the old stem. All chance for peaceful transition passes more irretrievably with each day that the war continues. The old world we loved is going, and I doubt very much that what immediately follows—if every nation blazes in the same conflagration—will be appreciably better, even in the “Democracies,” than what we have witnessed in Germany lately. In other words, I do not believe the things we condemn in Germany are innately German; but rather that they are born of war, revolution, defeat, frustration and suffering. They are evils which may come to every nation under the same conditions—conditions that are increasing in likelihood for the majority of the world with each day this war is prolonged.

What, then, is your conclusion? may be justly asked of me. Do you urge a defeatist acceptance of the inevitable? Do you want us to concur in the violent forms (you say you oppose) of the revolution and advocate the overthrow of fundamental principles underlying our way of life?

No, I cannot pledge my personal allegiance to those systems I disapprove of, or those barbarisms I oppose from the bottom of my heart, even if they *are* on the wave of the future. Nor do I propose the surrender of our basic beliefs. But I do feel that it is futile to get into a hopeless “crusade” to “save” civilization. I do not believe civilization can be “saved” simply by going to war. Neither can “democracy” or “liberty” or “our way of life” be saved by any such negative point of view. If we do not *better* our civilization, our way of life, and our democracy, there will be no

use trying to "save" them by fighting; they will crumble away under the very feet of our armies.

It seems to me that our task is to work toward a peaceful "revolution" here, or, rather, a reformation—to reform at home rather than crusade abroad. Our "revolution" will not take the form of a German, an Italian or a Russian revolution. Our answer to the world's problems is not their answer. It will not be the answer France is trying desperately to work out at this moment nor the answer that England will eventually find.

Our answer should not and will not be the answer of any European nation. It should be a solution peculiarly and saltily our own. It should be as American as the white steeples of New England or the skyscrapers of New York; as American as a boy's slang, as backyard life in small towns, as baseball and blue jeans. As American as our red-brick schools, standing like staunch citadels along our country roads; as white clapboard houses with green blinds; as unhedged gardens and open fields; as our stratoliners and our stream-lined trains; as our air-beacons, necklacing a continent at night, with their golden beams.

To desire a purely American solution is not to advocate strict "Isolationism." In national as in personal life, strict "Isolationism" seems to me a miserable ideal. But in both levels of living, most of us feel that our *first* duty—not our only duty, but our first duty—is to our own family and nation. Only by following this precept can we effectively give to the outsider. In national as in personal life one can give only out of strength, never out of weakness.

You may answer to my hypothesis that it is all very well to argue theoretically. But if your nation is invaded you cannot go about with your head in the stars and survey your world as if from a planet. What good would a plane-

tary view like yours have done France during the march on Paris; or what good would it do England under a rain of fire?

It would, of course, do no good at all, once war had begun. If I had been a French wife, waiting for word of my husband at the front; or if I were an English mother, shunting my children into a bombproof cellar, I would say impatiently, angrily even, "Yes, yes, a new world—the wave of the future—reform of abuses—certainly; but *first* we must win this war; *first* we must save our husbands, our children, our homes. *Then*, we can stop to think about such things."

If one were in the war, one could not do otherwise. But we are *not* in the war here in America, and if we cannot take a planetary view of the world's troubles, who can? A planetary point of view is necessary at times. If one never looks up to find the great dipper above the treetops, how can one be sure one is heading true north? The belligerents of this war can hardly help feeling hate, horror, shock, and anger. We, ourselves, cannot help feeling shock and horror; but at the same time we, in America, are in a unique position to judge the tragedies clearly. Surely our task is not voluntarily to surrender this point of vantage by climbing down into the maelstrom of war, where we can only add to the chaos; but rather to see as clearly as possible how to prevent such tragedies from happening here, and how best to assuage the sufferings caused by them abroad.

But if we are not now in the war, we *will* be, cry all the alarmists. Can't you see we will be invaded as surely as Belgium, Holland, and France? They, like you, didn't want war either. They, like you, had their heads in the stars. Can't you see that the Maginot Line was our first line of defense, that the British fleet is all that now stands

between us and foreign invasion? Can't you see that the ocean is no longer a barrier, that we are unprepared, etc., etc.?

The gigantic specter of fear is growing daily before us, whipped up by such arguments, speeches, denunciations and threats; and fanned by the terrible tales of war and suffering that come to us like parching winds each morning from the pages of our newspapers. There is more fear here today than in the countries which lived under the shadow of war for years in Europe. I know, because I was there. There is even more panic now, in some places in America, than in the nations that were actually under fire. A brilliant French woman, lecturing last winter among us, remarked on this fact:

"There is no fear in Britain, in France," she said, "probably no fear in Germany. Extraordinarily enough," she continued with devastating simplicity, "fear has gone somewhere else—to the countries which are not fighting, which are not menaced, to the countries 'at peace.'"

Perhaps fear is a good thing, you say? Perhaps their lack of fear led them into danger and our possession of it will make us better prepared for our ordeals? Perhaps. But fear and panic have not helped the cause of a single country in Europe. In fact, where they have appeared, they have only detracted from the strength of a nation.

I do not believe one should turn one's eyes or one's mind away from possible dangers. There is always possibility of danger, especially to a nation which is unprepared; and, in spite of our potential strength, we are at this moment unprepared both materially and spiritually. The people who argue that the Allies are our first line of defense cite many indisputable facts. These facts cannot be pooh-poohed or brushed aside. They should be faced, and faced squarely.

But they should not be allowed to loom so large that they block our view completely. They should not be built up so close to our eyes that we cannot see around or behind them.

One can quite logically line up navies, armies and forts like a boy's game of tin soldiers, cancel this side against that, and say we are outnumbered. This maneuver is very convincing on paper, but it seems to me to omit all the intangibles. It is perfectly true; but not the whole truth, because if this war has taught us anything, it is that we cannot put our faith in material defenses *alone*. An impregnable Maginot Line, a matchless army, an invincible navy—of what avail are these in themselves? Germany's success has not been due alone to her superb equipment. She has won as much from the national spirit incited in her people as from her mechanical strength. I am not now supporting the means by which this spirit was generated nor the direction in which it is turned; but, whether or not one likes it, one cannot deny its existence. It is the same spirit that the French military leaders tried to rouse at the eleventh hour in France. It is the same spirit Churchill inspired in England with his magnificent speeches: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat." Without this spirit of courage, self-sacrifice, and determination, it is doubtful whether any people can win a war—or avoid one.

I do not believe we need to be defended against a mechanized German army invading our shores, as much as against the type of decay, weakness, and blindness into which all the "Democracies" have fallen since the last war. We are in danger—yes, not so much from bombing planes as from those very conditions which brought on trouble in Europe, and will inevitably bring on trouble here if we do not face them.

There is no fighting the wave of the future, any more

than as a child you could fight against the gigantic roller that loomed up ahead of you suddenly. All you could do was to dive into it or leap with it. Otherwise, it would surely overwhelm you and pound you into the sand.

Man has never conquered the underlying forces of nature. But he has learned to understand these forces, to move erect among them, and to use them for his own ends. He cannot stop or bring the storms; but he can irrigate the desert and dam the flood. He cannot successfully defy nature, but he is able to follow, influence, and speed her course. And in doing so, he has learned to halt disease, to lessen suffering, and to increase his capacities for health and the appreciation of life.

Before he learned to use these natural forces, he was hopelessly at their mercy. He had to bow blindly before them or be swept along in their path. Today, is it not conceivable that he must again learn to use forces growing in the world—human forces this time; that he must learn not to resist the inevitable push of progress, but to make his life conform to it?

Before this war started, there were scattered elements trying to direct the course of progress in Europe. There were moderate forces working toward the future. There were idealists who wished to correct life peacefully, within the existing pattern, without completely destroying it in the process of improvement. There were farsighted men who wanted reform, but wanted it in their own way and in their own time. These men and these forces are now overrun by a bigger and more violent force which, one may well argue, was unnecessary. That the efforts of these pioneers should apparently be wasted is one of the great calamities of our age. They were a leaven of the future in the lump of the past. The tragedy is that there were not

enough of them or—for many reasons—they were unable to bring about changes with sufficient speed to forestall the coming violence.

We in America, however, might be able to succeed where they failed. With our isolated geographical position, our potential strength, and our particular gifts of temperament, it seems to me that we might be able to meet the new order without the violence we abhor—if only we could open our eyes to our present failings and admit our problems.

It is true that many of the things we love are going down. It is true there are dangerous and difficult times ahead. What do we intend to do about it? That is the problem facing all of us at this moment. No one is wise enough to give a concrete answer or a complete solution, but we may well question our directions, our motives, and our fears.

The wave of the future is coming and there is no fighting it. What is our course to be? Shall we leave our own troubles and crusade abroad? Are we afraid, not only of German bombers but also of change, of responsibility, of growing up? Are we afraid of paying the price of peace? For peace has a price as well as war. The price of peace is to be a strong nation, not only physically but also morally and spiritually. It is to build up not only a static strength, but a strength of growth, reform, and change. For only in growth, reform, and change, paradoxically enough, is true security to be found.

The United States has a heritage of reform. Its early settlers were inspired reformers. Its nation was built on ideals, prayers, and the dream of making a better world. Not only is this genius for progress in our tradition and in our veins, but we have been blessed with rare leaders in our history—practical visionaries who were not implac-

able fanatics or tyrants as so many leaders of the old world; but men of intelligence, tolerance, and spiritual beliefs.

Because of this tradition and this heritage, many of us have hoped that in America it should be possible to meet the wave of the future in comparative harmony and peace. It should be possible to change an old life to a new without such terrible bloodshed as we see today in the process in Europe.

We have been a nation who looked forward to new ideals, not back to old legends. A nation who preferred pioneering new paths to following old ruts; a nation who pinned its faith on dreams rather than on memories. Surely, among all the nations of the world it could best be sung of us:

"We are the music makers
And we are the dreamers of dreams."

And as the poem goes on to say:

"Each age is a dream that is dying
Or one that is coming to birth."

We, unhappily, are living in the hiatus between two dreams. We have waked from one and not yet started the other. We still have our eyes, our minds, our hearts, on the dream that is dying. But there is another on its way in the gray dawn. Is it not, perhaps, America's mission to find "the dream that is coming to birth"?

It is a tremendous challenge—this challenge to bring a dream to birth in a warlike world; to work out in moderation what the rest of the world is fighting out in bloodshed, intolerance, and hate. The task before us may mean sacrifice of selfish interests; it may mean giving up part of the ease of living and the high material standards we have been noted for. But it might also mean a heightening of more

important standards that are not material. It might mean a gain in spirit, in vigor, and in self-reliance, for which no price could be too high. The prospect of applying to reform at home the same spirit those nations abroad are applying to war, should not discourage us. We have faced as difficult ordeals before in our history. We should go out to meet such a test of our system, our beliefs, and our faiths, rejoicing "as a strong man to run a race."

Reform, however, should be more than a test of our beliefs. It should be a reaffirmation of them, an extension of them to wider fields and deeper recesses. It need not mean abandoning our fundamental principles, but rather a re-examination of them to determine whether we are following the dead letter or the living spirit which they embody. It should not mean forsaking the beacons which have led us in the past, but a rekindling of them. It should be essentially a life-giving process. In other words, it seems to me that a creative act is demanded of us. And like all acts of creation it will take labor, patience, pain—and an infinite faith in the future.

ADDENDA

In order to make this volume more widely and truly representative of the 80 per cent majority opinion which is serving today to keep America out of the European war, it has seemed advisable to us to include within its covers the brief expressions from all sorts of people from all over America which are here presented. There are among them those who are eminently worthy of having been given larger space in the main section of the book. In some cases, because of other pressing engagements, they were unable to prepare a more lengthy statement. There were also, always to be remembered, the physical limitations of the book itself.

Statement made public by Frank O. Lowden, former governor of Illinois:

The American people should insistently demand that Congress put a stop to step-by-step projection of the United States into undeclared war. Congress has not only the sole power to declare war but also the power and responsibility to keep the country out of war unless and until both Houses have otherwise decided.

Exceeding its expressed purpose, the lease-lend bill has been followed by naval action, by military occupation of bases outside the Western Hemisphere, by promise of unauthorized aid to Russia, and by other belligerent moves.

Such warlike steps, in no case sanctioned by Congress, undermine its constitutional powers and the fundamental principles of democratic government. The representatives of the people, in passing the lease-lend bill, expressed the national conviction

that preservation of the British Empire and China is desirable for us and for civilization.

We hold that view, but the intent of Congress was that lease-lend material should be transferred to belligerent ownership in the United States and utilized only to protect the independence of democracies.

We hold that in giving generous aid to these democracies at our seaboard we have gone as far as is consistent either with law, with sentiment or with security. Recent events raise doubts that this war is a clear-cut issue of liberty and democracy. It is not purely a world conflict between tyranny and freedom. The Anglo-Russian alliance has dissipated that illusion.

In so far as this is a war of power-politics, the American people want no part in it. American participation is far more likely to destroy democracy in this country and thus in the Western Hemisphere than to establish it in Europe. The hope of civilization now rests primarily upon the preservation of freedom and democracy in the United States.

That will be lost for a generation if we join in this war. We maintain that American lives should be sacrificed only for American independence or to prevent the invasion of the Western Hemisphere.

Few people honestly believe that the Axis is now, or will in the future be in a position to threaten the independence of any part of this hemisphere if our defenses are properly prepared.

Energies of this country should be concentrated on the defense of our own liberties. Freedom in America does not depend on the outcome of struggles for material power between other nations.

Signed also by: Former President Herbert Hoover; Republican Presidential Candidate Alfred M. Landon; former Vice President Charles G. Dawes; Irvin S. Cobb and Clarence Buddington Kelland, writers; John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers and former head of the C.I.O.; Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago; Geraldine Farrar, opera singer; J. Ruben Clark, former United States Ambassador to Mexico; Henry P. Fletcher, former Republican national chairman; Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, former Secretary

of the Interior; Felix Morley, editor and author; Hanford MacNider, former Minister to Canada, and J. Henry Scattergood, Philadelphia businessman.

Janet Ayer Fairbank:

As the war in Europe progresses, it becomes increasingly evident that the United States should take no part in it. As a people we are opposed to a totalitarian form of Government, but we must not lose sight of the fact that England started the conflict by declaring war at a time when she and the countries which were then her allies were totally unprepared to meet the German army in battle.

The same conditions face the United States today. We have sent to Britain the equipment our drafted men need in order to learn the rudiments of soldiering. Until they have been trained in modern warfare with modern weapons they cannot hope to defend themselves against the well equipped and schooled German soldier.

This is not our war. Our business is to train men for the defense of our country so that no foreign power can successfully attack us. For that aim we should conserve our strength in men and resources lest the United States be lost in endeavoring to save the world.

Peter Vischer, Editor, *Country Life*:

You don't have to be a military expert to realize the sad truth that we are woefully and shockingly unprepared, despite the billions of dollars we have been spending. That we haven't the guns, tanks, planes, ammunition, and transport necessary for modern warfare, is common knowledge.

No matter how intense your hatred of the totalitarian way of life, no matter how admirable and justified that hatred, you surely wouldn't want to ask American boys to risk their lives in war—any war—without giving them the weapons necessary for success, or at least the weapons essential for adequate protection? Sending men off to war unprepared is asking men who have just as much right to live as you have to commit public suicide. I, for one, shouldn't care to have that on my conscience.

The time has not yet passed when free Americans can stand up and say, as they are doing all over the land, "No, this time we shall not be led to war!" To my mind, the refusal of the people of this country to go to war represents the greatest expression of the democratic will in the history of the world.

Kathleen Norris:

Our first line of defense is, and always will be, our own border. The only navy that will ever protect us is our own Navy. The only army upon which we may rely, and which is an army unbeaten as yet in history, is our own Army. These we will support, these we will maintain, and in these we will put our confidence. For America, if she is to continue America, there can be no other course.

Congressman Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota:

The situation over which none of us had any control, but is just one of those dizzy twirls of the hand of fate which brought Russia into this war, has done a great deal to make people re-examine their thinking and to bring them to the realization that this is certainly not a war of idealism; that this is not the war which people said it was; that there must be something wrong with the people of this country who would now have us follow their minority group; that the man who told us three or four months ago that we should loan money and send supplies and perhaps even men to help Finland defeat Russia must have been wrong then if he is telling us now that we should send supplies, loan money and send men to Russia to defeat Finland.

General Thomas Hammond:

Powers that be in this country are thinking too much about the welfare of the rest of the world; too little about our own country.

Lillian Gish:

The sanest voice coming out of Europe today is that of Pope Pius the 12th, who believes that peace today is better for the

world than peace next week, next month or next year. If President Roosevelt agreed with this great man the world would have peace tomorrow.

Wayland Brooks:

The blood of America belongs to America.

Anton J. Carlson:

Can we shoot democracy into any nation?

George N. Peek:

Shall we dilute our nation's strength with the world's weakness. . . . America can impoverish herself by spending her substance on foreign wars.

Senator Dennis Chavez, New Mexico:

I for one am becoming a little annoyed at the idea that anyone who dares think more of America than he does of some other country can be accused of being disloyal.

His Excellency the Most Rev. Francis J. L. Beckman:

I reaffirm to you that the present conflict is not a "holy war," least of all a just war; but a war of one imperialism against the other in which godlessness is incidental to all belligerents. . . . This is a struggle which, if prolonged through our efforts, but for a miracle of God, may go on interminably until universal chaos and exhaustion encompass the warring nations.

Philip Lafollette:

The whole interventionist campaign has been centered around hatred for Hitler while step by step the interventionists have duplicated Hitler's basic strategy by promising one thing and doing the opposite.

Stuart Chase:

The people of the United States are in possession of a workable pattern for community survival and well-being. The people of Europe, Asia and Africa are not. I believe that any attempt by the United States forcibly to impose a pattern on the Old

World not only will fail, but almost certainly will shatter the American pattern. This will leave the world without stability and without hope anywhere.

Senator Gerald P. Nye of North Dakota:

There are those who interpret every reference of even the mildest critical nature against the British as some sort of condemnation of those brave and splendid people, the British people themselves.

This is childish reasoning. The government of Great Britain is trying for its own reasons to get us into its war. It is our business and our intention to stay out of that war. To stay out of it, we must oppose those who desire us in that war, and we must continue that opposition at every turn. The government of Britain, unblushingly and without reservation, does want us in that war. Our cause today, get it clear, is America's cause, and America's only. Today we must think of, act for, and if necessary fight and die for America—but America only.

Editorial from *The Saturday Evening Post*:

The American way is stony and toilsome. It will require of us such fortitude as we have almost forgotten, a spirit of self denial that is nourished by giving and much believing in one another. We have missed it. Yet we know where it is and how to find it again. To lose it in a world wide crusade for the defense of freedom would be an incomparable irony.

A Former Member of the Military Intelligence in France:

What have we to lose by staying out of war? We have nothing to lose and all to gain. The chances are immeasurably in our favor, since Hitler attacked Russia.

What have we to gain by going to war now? Military rule, concentration camps, charges and counter-charges, high living costs, scarcity of products, undernourishment, puny children, nervous exhaustion, *fear*, ever-present *fear*, and premature death, finally long rows of flag-draped coffins, on which mothers, sisters, and sweethearts throw themselves in uncontrollable anguish, while a snappy guard of honor presents arms and a military band plays a dirge.

Quincy Howe:

If the United States decides to support England, it may appear to be acting in behalf of peace and democracy, of collective security and resistance to aggression. In effect, however, the decision will mean that the greatest Empire on earth and the world's strongest nation will be putting their combined support behind the status quo everywhere.

Richard N. Johnson, *Boston Evening Transcript*:

Force may or may not conquer Hitler. But force by itself certainly is not going to bring victory for the cause of freedom. It may bring a temporary hollow victory; it may bring a truce till the opposing powers of force recuperate. But force alone will never bring permanent peace, spiritual progress or economic prosperity.

Senator Robert M. Lafollette, Jr., of Wisconsin:

Some interventionists have tried to smear with communism those of us who believe our best interests will be served by keeping out of war. Now the shoe is on the other foot! In the next few weeks the American people will witness the greatest whitewash act in all history. They will be told to forget the purges in Russia by the OGPU, the confiscation of property, the persecution of religion, the invasion of Finland, and the vulture role Stalin played in seizing half of prostrate Poland, all of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. These will be made to seem the acts of a "democracy" preparing to fight Nazism. Will the American people fall for all this? I do not believe it. They will refuse to let Uncle Sam be "a fellow traveler."

Senator Bennett Champ Clark of Missouri:

Can any one conceive of American boys being sent to their deaths singing "Onward Christian Soldiers" under the bloody banner of the Hammer and the Sickle, the emblem of the cruel extirpation of all religion?

Joseph P. Kennedy:

I do assert that by staying at peace we will be in a far better position to meet the gigantic problems we face. I repeat—the

real defeatists are those who have given up hope that America can stay out of war. This defeatist spirit must not prevail.

Senator Walter F. George of Georgia:

I have not accepted the fatalistic view that the country will be involved in war.

Representative John M. Vorys of Ohio:

The boys in the training camps, including the officers, are for keeping out of the wars in Europe, Africa and Asia. I know from personal observation and from those who have been touring the camps.

John N. Garner:

Public opinion is sound. It will be difficult to get this nation into war when public opinion is against it.

Boake Carter:

Our diplomacy has never been noted for its realism. In the past eight years it has decayed into a grim game of one man's whimsies.

Senator Charles W. Tobey of New Hampshire:

The greatest threat to our American way of life is right here in America, in Washington, where a large part of the Senate and House membership has abdicated or surrendered the powers granted them under the Constitution.

Editorial, *Chicago Tribune*:

Americans must feel that forces over which they have lost control are driving them remorselessly and steadily into war and that the checks supposed to be contained in their system of government are paralyzed. Their own common sense and their good judgment warn them against all this. They dread the consequences of a European war, both for the present and for the future, and every day they realize that Mr. Roosevelt is closer to the shooting.

Hanson Baldwin:

If a minority—vocal and vigorous and strident—leads the majority to a war it does not want, the minority and the nation will live to regret it. No modern war can be waged successfully without the whole-hearted and enthusiastic cooperation of fully ninety percent of the people. We may enter the war without that approval but the nation will suffer if we do.

Representative Harry Sauthoff of Wisconsin:

I have been conducting a poll in my district by mail to ascertain the views of my people with regard to our entrance into the present World War. The results have been astounding. To date we have received 67,633 ballots of which 3,911 were in favor of our entrance into the present World War, while 63,722 were opposed. In terms of percentage 94.2 percent were against while 5.8 percent were for.

Some of the interventionist newspapers have objected to the poll and sought to discredit it by ridicule. The amazing response of the people is the best answer to their criticism.

A great plea has been made by the interventionists that we should be united. My reply is "We are." When 94 percent of the people in my district, which is an outstanding district socially, economically, financially and spiritually and will challenge comparison with any other district in the United States, are united on the question of keeping out of this war, then I say that's unity. It's more unity than you could get on any public question today.

So I say to the interventionists, "You are the ones who are the disrupters. You are the ones who endanger the future of the United States and its people. You are the ones who are guilty of disunity. Cease your war mongering! The American people don't want it. Cease your name calling! It is the lowest and vilest form of argument. Cease your un-American activities in the interest of foreign lands and do what every real American ought to do, devote your thought, your efforts, and your interests to your own country and dedicate yourself to America first!"

Rufus Jones, Friends Service Committee:

We are being swept on by a cyclone of hate and fury into a worldwide barbarism and an animalism that have had no parallel in the records of the race. Every voice of reason cries out against it. Every note of revelation in Christ's Gospel is levelled against it. The still small voice within our souls insistently speaks against this way of solving the problems of life. There is a serene Spirit of truth and wisdom, invisible but not less real, calling to us above the tumult to exert every effort of ours, however feeble, to stop the immoral and inhuman processes sweeping across the world and to release the re-creative forces of life and light and love.

From the *Erie (Colo.) Herald*, July 11, 1941:

President Roosevelt made a five-minute speech July 4, suggesting that the American people rekindle the spirit of July 4, 1776, on this Independence Day. It is well that the citizenry didn't take the President at his word while so many British propagandists and members of the Royal Family are living within the shadows of the White House. Our ancestors in 1776 would have shot any one of them on sight.

Adelaide Hooker Marquand:

The United States can use its good offices to promote a peace in Europe and Asia that would leave no country ground into a festering submission. If we back one side through to an old fashioned victory, forcing democracy on unwilling people with the sword, Europe's ills will not be cured and our own ensuing ills will be richly deserved. We will be conniving into eternity in a damage to civilization requiring more centuries to repair than that caused by any temporary rotten social system such as Naziism or Communism. The best blood is the first to be spilled and civilization is lasting only in proportion to the mental and physical vitality of its heritage. War is the greatest destroyer of civilization—the very greatest.

William Cardinal O'Connell of Boston:

If we are going out to try to impose our method of life on the whole world, it is not only nonsensical and impossible, but it

is utterly wrong; it is tyranny. If they are happier in their way of life, let them alone. But let's try to give them the example that is the leadership America ought to have.

Col. J. V. Kuznik, U.S.A., retired:

The interventionists cannot point to one tangible reason for our entering the war. Nothing but fantastic suppositions and hypothetical situations are advanced to justify their blood-thirsty sympathy for Britain. We cannot point to one single case that, under the war acts of international law, would justify us in declaring war against the German people.

Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan:

Our priceless freedom definitely would be blitzkrieged by our own entry into active shooting war, because war swiftly assigns every citizen to his anonymous cog in a vast impersonal machine.

Representative Lewis D. Thill of Wisconsin:

Opposition to war here in Washington is gaining ground every day. Many who a few months ago were weakly saying, "We are in the war," are now convinced that America can win its fight to stay out of war.

Gretta Palmer:

The present war in Europe is just another war—that fact shows, more and more clearly, through all the tissue of propaganda. Is it for Democracy against the Totalitarian way of life? Not while Soviet Russia is our promised ally. Is it to be fought because "Hitler's promises cannot be trusted"—the classic argument against a negotiated peace today? Hardly. The United States cannot be taken into this War without having its President break his own most sacred promise to the people, his pledge to keep the peace.

Representative Clifton A. Woodrum of Virginia:

The idea of this country's going off and trying to settle the conflicting emotions and ideologies of Europe to me is ridiculous even if we were prepared to do so, and we are not.

Representative Stephen A. Day of Illinois:

If anybody has a notion in his head that he can come to this Congress and get any sort of declaration that will put us aggressively into the European war or that will send American expeditionary forces abroad, I think the sooner he gets the idea out of his head the better it will be.

Representative Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois:

Can anything better destroy the usefulness and morale of a soldier than to diminish his faith in the integrity of the Government which he is expected to defend?

Representative Clare E. Hoffman of Michigan:

Unless we stop the drive toward war and the never-ceasing, increasing denial of rights guaranteed under our Constitution, this Nation will no longer remain a democracy.

Editorial from *Goodland (Kan.) Daily News*:

There can be no faith in the word of the Government until sometime it keeps its word. The citizen owes something to his Government, but he has a right to expect a square deal from his Government in return.

Representative William S. Hill of Colorado:

It isn't wholesome for the Government to violate contracts with its citizens. Granting the right of the country to conscript the services of any who may be needed for the national defense, it isn't moral to make promises and forsake them.

Representative Philip A. Bennett of Missouri:

Congress has neither moral nor legal right to declare a phony emergency just to give this administration the right to keep these boys in uniform.

Editorial in the *New York Daily News*:

Raw materials have made us the richest people in the world, though we're none too happy just now.

Are we supposed to give a lot of this wealth away, after the war, to Britain's Indian subjects, Russia's underfed millions, Ger-

many's industrial plants, China's hordes? Or are we to sell it at a profit, or maybe only at cost?

Bringing the "four freedoms" to the world by means of a bloody war plus a resurrected League of Nations, are we also to be the Santa Claus for all the postwar world?

What the hell is going on, anyhow?

Ellen F. FitzSimons:

Look back on your history. Every great empire has fallen sooner or later. We do not want Britain to fall—but she herself did not prepare for what many of her statesmen foresaw, and warned against. Let us face the facts as they are, and the possibilities which exist—let us save America first, and not betray our heritage through unreasoning sentimentalism.

Senator Robert R. Reynolds of North Carolina:

As to fear of invasion of this country, the Axis powers are daily weakening as a result of the destruction of their equipment and the loss of their men, rather than being strengthened in so far as fighting personnel and adequate equipment is concerned.

Representative Joseph W. Martin of Massachusetts:

There will come a terrible danger that we in America may lose those four freedoms we hear talked about so much and which we are supposed to carry to all the peoples everywhere.

Senator John A. Danaher of Connecticut:

American citizens have a perfect right, in fact it is their duty, to ascertain the facts and not be coerced or beguiled by propaganda efforts to take us into war.

Editorial, *New York Journal and American*:

If the American people want to avoid being *tricked* or *thrust* into the war they must *make their will prevail*—at Washington, with their elected officials and representatives in the Government.

Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts:

If . . . the nation's peril is greater than it was a year ago . . . it is because of the course that we have pursued in our foreign policy to date, labeled to be one to keep us out of war, but many believe it has actually operated to lead us day by day into the war.

Representative Daniel A. Reed of New York:

Is the American youth to be led to slaughter by the paid propaganda of those who see in such a course a path to greater personal and political power?

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



101 184

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY